REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 127 24 EA 000 759
ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS AND UNIVERSITY GOALS--A STUDY IN
CONFLICT AND COOPERATION. FINAL REPORT.
BY- GROSS, EDWARD GRAMBSCH, PAUL V.
MINNESOTA UNIV., MINNEAPOLIS
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0781 PUB DATE JUN 67
CONTRACT OEC-SAE-5-10-099
EDRS PRICE MF-$1.25 HC-$12.08 300P.

DESCRIPTORS- *UNIVERSITIES, *ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, *FACULTY, *OBJECTIVES, CONFLICT, POWER STRUCTURE, PERCEPTION, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, QUESTIONNAIRES, *UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION, ACADEMIC FREEDOM, CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS, MINNEAPOLIS,

A STUDY OF ADMINISTRATOR AND FACULTY PERCEPTION OF UNIVERSITY GOALS WAS DEVELOPED UTILIZING A QUESTIONNAIRE MAILED TO ALL ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL AND TO A 10 PERCENT SAMPLE OF THE FACULTY MEMBERS OF 68 UNIVERSITIES. THE UNIVERSITIES WERE SELECTED BY CRITERIA WHICH INCLUDED THE GRANTING OF DOCTORAL DEGREES IN AT LEAST THREE OF FOUR FIELDS (HUMANITIES, BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES, PHYSICAL SCIENCES, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES). STATISTICAL ANALYSIS WAS BASED UPON A 46.4 PERCENT RESPONSE (4494 ADMINISTRATORS AND 2730 FACULTY). FIVE MAJOR CATEGORIES OF 47 GOALS WERE DEFINED--(1) 17 OUTPUT GOALS AIMED AT CHANGING THE STUDENTS' IDENTITY OR CHARACTER IN SOME FUNDAMENTAL WAY, EQUIPPING THE STUDENT TO DO SOMETHING SPECIFIC FOR THE SOCIETY HE WILL BE ENTERING, CONDUCTING RESEARCH FOR THE PRODUCTION OF NEW KNOWLEDGE OR THE SOLVING OF PROBLEMS, OR RENDERING DIRECT SERVICE TO THE NONACADEMIC COMMUNITY, (2) SEVEN ADAPTATION GOALS REFLECTED THE NEED OF THE ORGANIZATION TO COME TO TERMS WITH ITS ENVIRONMENT, (3) TEN MANAGEMENT GOALS REFLECTED DECISIONS ON WHO SHOULD RUN THE UNIVERSITY, THE NEED TO HANDLE CONFLICT, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PRIORITIES TO DETERMINE WHICH OUTPUT GOALS SHOULD BE GIVEN MAXIMUM ATTENTION, (4) SEVEN MOTIVATIONAL GOALS SOUGHT TO INSURE A HIGH LEVEL OF SATISFACTION ON THE PART OF THE STAFF AND STUDENTS, WITH EMPHASIS ON LOYALTY TO THE UNIVERSITY, AND (5) SIX POSITIONAL GOALS SERVED TO MAINTAIN THE POSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY PRIMARILY IN TERMS OF COMPARING IT TO OTHER UNIVERSITIES. ORDERED VARIABLES ANALYZED BY GOODMAN AND KRUSKAL'S GAMMA INCLUDED PERCEPTIONS OF UNIVERSITY POWER STRUCTURES AND CONCEPTIONS OF WHAT ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY FELT GOALS SHOULD BE. (JK)

ED014127

[redacted]

Final Report
to the U. S. Office of Education

BR-5-0781
PA 24

Project Bureau No. 5078 (formerly project 2633)
Academic Administrators and University Goals
Edward Gross, Professor of Sociology and Industrial Relations
Paul V. Grambsch, Dean, School of Business Administration
University of Minnesota

University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
55455

EA 000 759

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

Project Bureau No. 5078 (formerly project 2633)
Contract No. SAE OE 5-10-099

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS AND UNIVERSITY GOALS: A STUDY IN CONFLICT AND COOPERATION

June 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 .... INTRODUCTION Page 1

CHAPTER 2 .... METHOD Page 6

CHAPTER 3 .... THE GOALS OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES Page 57

CHAPTER 4 .... THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GOALS AND GOAL VALUES Page 74

CHAPTER 5 ....GOALS RELATED TO GLOBAL MEASURES Page 93

CHAPTER 6 .... WHAT DO RESPONDENTS AT DIFFERENT KINDS OF UNIVERSITIES FEEL THAT THE GOALS SHOULD BE? Page 128

CHAPTER 7 .... THE POWER STRUCTURE OF UNIVERSITIES Page 158

CHAPTER 8 .... HOW DO UNIVERSITIES WITH DIFFERENT GOAL EMPHASES DIFFER IN POWER STRUCTURE? Page 178

CHAPTER 9 .... COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATORS WITH FACULTY Page 232

CHAPTER 10........ ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION AND UNIVERSITY GOALS: A SUMMARY Page 246

APPENDIX: THE QUESTIONNAIRE Page 283

CHAPTER 1

I. Introduction

A. The Problem Investigated

This introduction will cover the problem which was investigated and will state the major goals of the study. Discussions of method, in detail, are reserved to Chapter 2.

In many organizations, becoming an administrator and pursuing an administrative career is regarded as upward mobility. Such seems usually to be the case in organizations like businesses, factories, and the armed services as well as most branches of government. When, however, an organization begins to make use of large numbers of professional persons, particularly of scientists who are committed to the values of original research, a change in the position of administrators often occurs. In hospitals, research laboratories, and particularly in universities, occupancy of an administrative post may be the object of quite mixed feelings. In a large business, a man's choice as department head is greeted with acclaim by his friends and colleagues and is felt to constitute a proper subject for congratulation. On the other hand, in a university a man's accepting a position as chairman or as dean may be the occasion for the expression of condolences on the part of his colleagues and friends. Not infrequently persons who assume such positions will themselves derogate the position by insisting that it is "temporary" or that it was taken on as a duty. There is often a feeling, at the overt level at least, that the fundamental task is the professional or the scientific one, and that administration exists largely to facilitate that task. Thus, in the case of nurses it is usually felt that contact with the patient is the significant activity and that nursing administration is secondary and consists of little more than red tape and other bureaucratic activities to be gotten through as soon as possible.

In the case of the university, it is usually assumed that the fundamental reasons why universities exist revolve about activities such as teaching and doing research, though what these activities are is often not specified in detail. It is further assumed that the carrying out of these tasks is the primary responsibility of the academic staff; that is, mainly professors, researchers, and their helpers. The administration, it is assumed, has as its main task that of providing "support" for the academic activities. "Support" is usually defined to include maintenance activities (securing funds and facilities, arranging for counseling and assignment of students to classes and dormitories, arranging details of faculty selection and promotion) and integration activities (coordinating of departments and schools, settling of internal disputes, representing the department or school to outside bodies). No one disagrees with the claim that the support activities are essential but there is a feeling that they are less important than the academic activities.

This ideal situation has however been changing within recent years as academic administration has grown in importance because of certain vast societal changes. The increased professionalization of occupations and expansion of demand for educated persons sent an increasing proportion of an expanding population into the universities. International competition produced pressures upon the university to train more scientists and engineers. The accelerated arms and space race led to a deep penetration of the university by research foundations and government agencies, upsetting traditional status relations and forcing many departments or parts of departments into becoming "productive organizations" for paying clients. Such changes were accompanied by large administrative changes in response to demands by state legislatures, private foundations, and governmental agencies for an accounting of how monies were being spent and whether the organization was being administered in an efficient manner. A major result has been an increase in the number of administrative personnel (especially in central administration) and an increase in their power.

The size of this increase in power is not known with any precision but the increase in numbers and powers, whatever their dimensions, have been lamented and resented by many, particularly the academic staff. A growth in the power of administrators represents an upset in the presumed balance between the academic activities on campus and the support activities. Academic staff these days often grumble that administrators are comparatively overpaid, and that too much attention seems to be given over to "support" activities (often simply identified as red tape) rather than to the goals of the university as they see them. There is resentment as well of what are felt to be illegitimate pretensions of some administrators to "represent" the faculty or the university. The growth in power of administrators is not, in itself, necessarily undesirable even to the academic person (who holds quite traditional views of what the university ought to be doing), provided that administrators use their power to help the university attain goals which the academic people accept. The situation only becomes a genuine source of concern when administrators both have more power than the faculty and at the same time use that power to pursue goals which the faculty considers undesirable, or at least engage in activities which make the pursuit of what the faculty regard as desirable goals more difficult.

It is quite clear that, in order to answer the question of whether academic administrators constitute a legitimate object of grievance or not, we need some hard data, such data often being absent from the frequently sterile debates on this issue. In particular in order to assess the role of university administrators in the attainment of academic goals we need data on the following subjects: (1) What are the goals of American universities? Although this subject is often simply taken for granted, it is rarely discussed in any detail and such statements of goals as are usually made are vague. To say merely "teaching and research" is hardly enough since it leaves open the central question: Teaching what, and doing research on what, to what extent and for how long? Nor do such statements as "producing well rounded students" or "preservation of the cultural heritage" help very much either. The objection is not that these are unattainable or over idealistic but rather, when stated in this form, one has no way of knowing whether one is making any progress in achieving them or not. However desirable, they are nonoperational.

Furthermore, the university is a large complex organization and consequently, it may be expected that it will have a large number of goals. This is particularly true of the American university with its close association with pressure from the local area for practical results and recently from the government for applied research results. Mixed in with goals there may also be a great many other activities which the university is engaging in without thinking of them as goals. To some persons the university is not an organization at all and consequently the very notion of "goals" is difficult to understand. Rather they think of the university as a place which has gradually grown up and which is best described by simply noting what it happens to be doing at the time.

The first kind of data, then, that we need are data on the goals of universities. What are those goals? Before we can answer any kind of a question as to whether any group, administrators or others, are perverting or diverting effort toward those goals, we need to know what the goals are. Furthermore, this must be based on data and not simply be a collection of peoples' views as to what the university ought to be. This does not however mean that we do not have any interest in peoples' conceptions of what the goals ought to be. Quite the contrary; complaints that any group, such as administrators, may be perverting the goals may perhaps be discovered by an examination not simply of what the goals in fact happen to be but of what people think they ought to be. Hence we should also examine the question of what faculty and administrators think the goals of the university ought to be.

For those concerned with changes in goals (whether interested in halting changes in undesired directions or initiating changes in other directions), one important kind of information revolves about what factors affect both goals and how persons in universities perceive and feel about the goals. Among those often considered important by students of the university, attention will be given particularly to size of university, productivity, prestige, degree of emphasis on graduate study, and the location of the university. The foregoing measures are called "global" since they refer to characteristics of the university as a whole. The nature of goals and person's feelings about them are of course affected by background factors and by their position in the university.

After having found out what the goals of the university are, how people feel about them, and what some of the variables are that make goals what they are as well as how people feel about them, we shall turn to the question of whether there is any relationship between the locus of power in a university and the kind of goals that the university pursues. The central question here will be whether universities in which administrators have more power than faculty to determine university goals differ in the structure of goals from universities in which this is not the case. In addition, of course, interest will attach to whether there is any relationship between different power structures and different goal emphases.

Lastly, we come to the question of whether administrators and faculty differ in how they see the goals of the university and what they think those goals ought to be. Here our attention will be directed to the question: Whatever the differences in power between administrators and faculty, are the differences in perceptions and conceptions of university goals great enough so that one has to be concerned about administrators having power? As we shall see, our findings suggest that administrators and faculty in fact see the university much the same so that there is little cause for alarm in spite of the fact, as we shall see, that administrators do indeed tend to have more power than the faculty to determine university goals.

B. Other Related Research

A considerable amount of general literature (much of it speculative, such as the tongue-in-cheek Parkinson's Law) exists on the general subject of the size and power of the administrative component of organizations. This literature is analyzed critically in works by Blau and Scott, Simon, Etzioni, Presthus, Thompson, Halpin and others. Most of it relates only indirectly, if at all, to educational organizations. Little account is taken of the fact that the work of the university is the responsibility mainly of "professions," a group which is highly educated, committed, and with professed ideas on how the university should be run. Kornhauser notes this critical difference between universities and such organizations as businesses, or military and governmental bureaucracies, but he is more interested in scientists in such organizations. Most relevant are the works of sociologists such as Reissman, Caplow and McGee, and Gouldner. The latter's study of a small, private liberal arts college distinguished between "locals" (oriented to the college) and "cosmopolitans" (oriented to their colleagues or their discipline). Such studies, however, concentrated mainly on the faculty.

Helpful were the organizational studies of universities by Berelson, Lazarsfeld and Thielens, Rogoff, Riesman, Knapp and Goodrich, Knapp and Greenbaum, and Barton. From these we drew many of our organizational measures. Useful also, for ideas on structure, were such descriptive works as those of Corson, Capen, and Woodburne.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

The basic technique used was a mailed questionnaire, supplemented by interviews and by a survey of the literature, together with various sources of institutional data.

A. Setting Up Project

Both of the principal investigators were engaged full time in their academic duties. The design provided that they would each take one quarter off for full-time work on the project together with interviewing but during the rest of the year they would be carrying on their regular duties. In order to enable the project research to go forth at all times, a Project Supervisor was employed on a full-time basis. This person, a graduate student in sociology at the University of Minnesota, administered the day-to-day affairs of the study, particularly the questionnaire portion of it. He also functioned as an immediate supervisor of the research and clerical staff. In addition three research assistants were taken on to assist in carrying out the study. Two of these were graduate students in sociology, one a graduate student in industrial relations. Later when one of the principal investigators, (Edward Gross) moved to the University of Washington (Seattle, Washington), the greater part of project activities were shifted to the University of Washington. The project supervisor also moved and continued in his capacity. Three new research assistants, all graduate students in sociology, were employed at the University of Washington.

In addition, clerical assistants were employed as necessary. It was also necessary to employ persons to perform key punch operations at the time of the analysis at the University of Washington. Since the questionnaire was long and there were close to 10,000 respondents, the key punching job itself was an enormous one requiring considerable coordination and planning.

At the University of Washington the study was carried out with the help of the Institute for Sociological Research of the Department of Sociology (Director: Otto N. Larsen). We mention this fact since through the Institute it was possible to make use of these services of Thomas Steinburne, a full-time member of the Institute staff, who specialized in computer operations. Without his Activity And interest, the processing of the enormous amount of data would have been impossible.

B. Development of the Research Instrument

If this study has any attributes of originality, they center mainly about the way in which university goals have been analyzed and treated. The reader will note certain statements treated as goals which he might not think of as being goals, for example, "Keep harmony between departments or divisions of the university when such departments or divisions do not see eye to eye on important matters," "Keep costs down as low as possible through more efficient utilization of time, and space, reduction of course duplication, etc.," or "Hold our staff in the face of inducements offered by other universities." Most persons think of a goal only in terms of some kind of output and these illustrations do not seem to involve an output which is consumed by outsiders. They would seem to be more what some persons think of as maintenance activities. It is the investigators belief that the analysis of goals of organizations requires that many activities that are normally thought of as maintenance or support activities be thought of as goals of the organization. Since so much attention is given to this claim in the study and since we asked our respondents to deal with some 47 goals, some explanation is necessary on why our method required such a large number of goals. Most persons, in thinking of universities, think simply of the three goals of teaching, research, and community service. We have not simply elaborated in detail on those goals in this study but rather have a variety of others which represent, in our judgment, goals of a wholly different character. In order to make this clear (and in part because it resulted in a considerable increase in the length of the questionnaire) we must present the theoretical justification for the definition of organizational goals.

(1) The Definition of Organizational Goals

The central concept in the study of organizations is that of the organizational goal. One might even claim that the notion of a goal is coincidental with that of an organization. Parsons* sees goal attainment as an aspect of all systems: all systems, in order to survive, must attain whatever goals they set out for themselves. However a special kind of a system; namely the organization, is singled out as being that in which the problem of goal attainment has primacy over all other problems.** Whatever authors have to say on the general subject there seems general agreement on this point. It is the dominating presence of a goal which marks off an "organization" (usually used to refer to formal organizations) from all other kinds of systems. In terms of MacIver's distinction between communal and associational relationships,*** organizations are those whose rationale is primarily associational. In the case of a communal relationship, persons are met for the pleasure intrinsic to the relationship itself, as in the case of a group of friends, a clique, a gang, or nuclear family. Such a group may indeed develop goals (attacking another gang, having a baby) but even if they fail in the attainment of those goals, the group does not necessarily break up. It does break up when hostilities and cleavages mean that persons are no longer at home in one another's presence. On the other hand an associational relationship is one in which persons are met in order to pursue some goal, and their meeting is a means toward that end. It is not necessary, in this case, that they should like one another or indeed have feelings toward one another that are any more positive than the minimum necessary to work together to attain the common goal.

---

*See Talcott Parsons et al., (eds.) Theories of Society: New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, pp. 38-41.

**Talcott Parsons, "A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Formal Organizations," in Talcott Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies, New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1960, Chap. 1.

***Robert M. MacIver, Community: A Sociological Study, New York: Macmillan, 1936.

It is the presence of such a goal and the consequent organization of effort so as to maximize the probability of attaining the goal which characterizes modern organizations. It is certainly the basis for the rationality in organizations which Weber found so remarkable and to which is given credit for the great accomplishments that modern organizations have made in healing the sick, attacking the enemy, producing a high standard of living, incarcerating the criminal, organizing the distribution of goods, or administering the affairs of an empire.

In spite, however, of the very great amount of research and theoretical attention which has been given to formal organizations, it is surprising how little attention has been given to developing a clear definition of what is meant by goal in the first place.* It seems to be taken for granted in most studies, and yet what the goal or goals of particular organizations are is an empirical matter and needs to be discovered.

Etzioni defines an organizational goal as "a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize."** But this definition immediately raises the question, pointed to by many of _whose_ state of affairs it is that is desired. Theoretically, there could be as many desired states for the organization as there are persons in it, if not more. What appear to be goals from the point of view of the top administrators may not be goals at all from the point of view of those further down.

But even before one can talk about different perceptions or organizational goals, it is essential to distinguish private from organizational goals. A private goal consists of a future state that the individual desires for himself. Such a notion comes close to the psychologist's conception of a motive. This meaning may be distinguished from what a particular person desires *for the organization as a whole*.* The latter comes closer to the notion of an organizational goal although it still consists of something that the particular person whishes and may not at all correspond to the organization's goals. Further, it still leaves open the question of how one is to determine an organization's goals when there are differences of opinion. In a small organization there may not be much difficulty for there the top man's personal goals for the organization *are* the organization's goals. It is this simplification which made it possible for classical economics to develop the theory of the corporation (as a "person") without being concerned much about developing a precise definition ~~or~~ of organizational goal which was any different than the goal of the entrepreneur. The firms that the classical economists were talking about were in the main small ones which had essentially no greater problem to solve than decide what price to sell its product at and how many units to produce for the market. Once organizations grow large then one must be concerned with the possibility that there will be many persons in a position to influence the goals of the organization.** In the case of ideological organizations, where personal values coincide, there may be a close correspondence between private goals for the organization and group goals. Yet in general one cannot assume that private and group goals will coincide. In fact in the typical case it is safe to say that they will not. It is consequently necessary to offer a person an inducement to participate,*** so that he attains his

---

*Herbert Simon, "On the Concept of Organization Goal," _Administrative Science Quarterly_, 8:1-22, 1964.

**Amitai Etzioni, _Modern Organizations_, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964, p. 6.

---

*See Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (eds.), *Group Dynamics*, Evanston: Row Peterson, 1953, pp. 308-311.

**See Richard Cyert and James G. March, *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, Chap. 3.

***James G. March and Herbert Simon, *Organizations*, New York: Wiley, 1958, Chap. 4.

personal goal through the group goal of the organization. That is,when the organization attains its group goal, means are provided for taking care of the personal goals of the persons in it so that they will then be motivated to participate. They must be motivated to participate to the extent that they will give up their personal goals for the organization as a whole should these differ from organizational goals. Nevertheless in order to avoid any reification of the concept, it is necessary to emphasize that goals will always exist in the minds of certain persons. That is to say, although an organizational goal is not the same thing as a personal goal nor is it necessarily the same as the goal that a particular person desires for an organization (as distinct from what he desires for himself) it certainly would seem that one kind of evidence on the nature of organization goals would consist of the statements of particular persons attesting what they thought the organizations' goals were.

Thompson and McEwan* and Parsons** have attempted to define goals in terms of system linkages. Both have seen a goal as involving some type of output to a larger society. In this sense organizations are always subsystems of larger systems, the goal of one sub-system being a means or input of a different subsystem. In the simplest case the production of automobile batteries is a goal to the firm that manufactures them but will be a means or input to an automobile manufacturing firm. Such an approach has the great value of emphasizing the need to relate organizations to one another and to the surrounding society.*** Further when goals are defined in this manner it becomes clear that those within organizations have only a limited amount of freedom to set the goals of the organization. They will be constrained by what outsiders can be persuaded to accept. On the other hand such an emphasis may tend to underestimate the contribution that rational decision-makers within organizations make in choosing the goals of organizations rather than being limited to the demands of the market.* A more serious limitation of the output approach follows from the fact that organizations have a great many outputs, both intended and unintended, many of which will be no different than functions or consequences. It becomes a problem to single out certain kinds of outputs as the goals of the organization. The importance of by-products in industrial organizations should alert the investigator to the danger here.

---

*James D. Thompson and Wm. J. McEwen, "Organization Goals and Environment," American Sociological Review, 23:23-50, 1958.

**Talcott Parsons, "A Sociological Approach..." op. cit., p. 17.

***The failure to do so was one of the earliest criticisms of the Classic Hawthorne studies. See Henry A. Landsberger, Hawthorne Revisited, Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University, 1958, Chap. III.

In spite of the strictures we have suggested on the definitions offered thus far, there is no doubt that they all touch on the elements of a definition of goals. Goals will exist in someone's mind and they will involve the relationship between an organization and the situation in which it is implicated.

An important contribution has been made by Etzioni** in a work in which he criticizes the goal approach to the study of organizations as being too limited. To define an organization solely in terms of its goal and therefore to judge its effectiveness in terms of its degree of success in obtaining that goal is to doom the investigator to disappointment. The "metaphysical pathos" to which Gouldner*** has called attention -- namely the pessimism of those who see men doomed forever to disappointment in their organizational hopes -- Etzioni sees as being due to expecting too much. Few organizations succeed in attaining their goals to the degree that those in them will wish they could be attained. One typically must settle for a good deal less and the leaders of organizations, their hopes high, would seem to be always expecting more than they will ever receive. Rather than seeing these limited results as a consequence of man's inherent limitations or as the basis for a sad romantic lament on man's smallness in the face of his large goals, Etzioni takes the view that the definition itself may be at fault. He compares organizations to electric lights and other types of mechanical equipment which may have very low efficiencies. Much of the energy may be lost in heat. Nevertheless no one expresses great concern but rather compares one mechanical gadget to another, and discovers that one may be twice as efficient as another even though it is only 10 per cent efficient, compared to the other which is 5 per cent efficient. However, although Etzioni makes this point, and insists the greater part of his book makes use of this approach (which he calls a "systems approach") he does not spell out precisely how this approach would lead to any different definition or approach to organizational goals than any other. Such is a major purpose of this paper.

---

*Cf. The distinction between what Alvin W. Gouldner calls a "rational" and "natural system" model. In "Organizational Analysis," in Robert K. Merton et. al. (eds.), Sociology Today, New York: Basic Books, 1959, Chap. 18.

**Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, op. cit., pp. 16-19.

***Alvin W. Gouldner, "Metaphysical Pathos and the Theory of Bureaucracy," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, pp. 71-82.

THE BUREAUCRATIC PERSONALITY: A FRUITFUL LEAD

One of the classics in organizational analysis is Merton's discussion of the tendencies of some persons to make ends of means in organizations.* The relevance of this discussion for organizational goals has not been given explicit attention in the literature although, as we shall endeavor to show, it has important implications for the understanding of organizational goals. Merton pointed, it will be recalled, to a possible dysfunction in formal organizations. In order that an organization should be able to accomplish its goals, a person must be required to conform to explicitly laid down rules. Only through this means could the organization's special advantages of precision and predictability be enjoyed. In order to insure that such precision and predictability would in fact result, it was necessary to insist upon rule compliance. Yet that very insistence might lead to persons' forgetting that rules existed, after all, only in order to facilitate goal attainment. Some persons then might be carried away by the very rules and insist on compliance with them even at the expense of organizational goals. Merton's examples include the requirement in the early part of World War II that navy officers should carry calling cards, when the latter were destined for the service in the battles of the South Pacific, or when an explorer was denied citizenship on the grounds that he was out of the United States for a period of time, in spite of the fact that that absence involved service on a U.S. expedition exploring Antarctica. It is such overemphasis that has lead to the association between bureaucracy and red tape and that has helped make the bureaucrat into a synonym for the haughty, unapproachable agent.

---

*Robert K. Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," in Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1957, pp. 195-206. The opening statement in the article reads: "A formal, rationally organized social structure involves clearly defined patterns of activity in which, ideally, every series of actions is functionally related to the purposes of the organization," (p. 195).

It is remarkable the attention that this statement has attracted in spite of the fact that it is not actually based on specific research. We do not know whether the phenomenon that Merton describes is common in organizations, whether there is variation in frequency of occurrence of the bureaucratic type in different organizations, nor of the process whereby persons might be lead to substitute means for ends. Assuming that such persons do in fact exist in organizations, an important question is whether organizations make persons behave in this manner or whether organizations attract persons who feel comfortable in the presence of strict rules.*

---

*On this issue, see O. Sperling, "Psychoanalytic Aspects of Bureaucracy," The Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 19:88-100, 1950.

The fact that there seems nothing automatic about the impact of organizations on persons in them in this respect is attested to by Turner's classic article* on the navy disbursing officer who was found to take advantage of his opportunities in the navy to behave in a manner quite different from Merton's bureaucrat.

But, for our purposes, the most important implication of Merton's discussion is the assumption which seems to underlie it. The assumption may be stated briefly as follows: The great danger in formal organizations is that, in their interest in seeing to it that certain means are taken care of, persons will lose sight of the end to which these means are meant to contribute. This is certainly undeniable although we repeat, the extent to which there is need to be concerned about the danger still remains an empirical question. What we wish to point out is that there is a clear assumption that any activity other than one which is directed towards the overall goal or goals of the organization does not by that token make a contribution to those goals. Persons who get caught up in their work or excited about the particular activity in which they are engaged are warned (by those following Merton) to be careful less they forget what the organization is all about, after all.

We do not imply, of course, that only those whose activity contributes directly to goal attainment in an organization may be said to be making a contribution to that goal. It is freely conceded in any organization that all persons who are given specific assignments in the division of labor of the organization are making a contribution. It is nevertheless felt that the activities of the several participants in the organization, insofar as they are broken down into departments or other units each of which has subgoals or targets, are to be conceived of essentially as half-way stations on the road to the over-all organizational goals. Their behavior therefore is organizationally meaningful only insofar as it makes a contribution either directly or indirectly to those goals. The particular arrangements are goal-relevant only insofar as they may be interpreted as making some kind of a contribution to a set of overall goals whatever these goals are.

---

*Ralph H. Turner, "The Navy Disbursing Officer as Bureaucrat," American Sociological Review, 12:342-348, 1947.

THE PROBLEM OF SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE

A major finding of a large amount of recent research on organization goals is that no organization can spend all of the time of its participants on goal attainment. At least some of the time, and perhaps a great deal, must be spent on activities which in no sense make even an indirect contribution to goal attainment.

One of the first to point this out was Bales* in his studies of task-oriented small groups under laboratory conditions. He found that two major sets of processes were in operation in these groups. The groups, on being assigned a particular task or goal, would typically begin by giving their attention to the most efficient way of moving towards that goal, which consisted of solutions to various problems which he posed to them. Very clearly, however, it was discovered that other kinds of activities began to make their appearance. When someone would make a proposal that a given approach be tried, others had to agree, disagree, or take no stand, and this activity began to divide the group up on the basis of their estimates of the most worthwhile procedures. The consequence of such cleavage was the development of feelings toward one another or toward the solutions proposed, irritation at not having one's own views taken properly into account, as well as ordinary fatigue. It became necessary, Bales found, for the group to stop its goal-directed activity and give some attention to repairing the social damage that was being done as the group attempted to move towards the solution of the problem. A kind of

---

*See Robert F. Bales, "Task Roles and Social Roles in Problem-Solving Groups," in Eleanor F. Maccoby, Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene L. Hartley (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology, New York: Henry Holt, 1958, pp. 437-447.

"maintenance" activity was necessary, with certain persons assuming the role of "maintenance engineers", as it were, in giving attention to what Bales came to speak of as "social-emotional" needs. Such needs might be taken care of in a phase manner or in other ways. It has of course been the experience of persons who have worked with conference groups and other kinds of task-oriented groups that some time must always be given to such maintenance activities. For example, all have noticed the tendency of many meetings to begin with informal chit-chat, and to end with laughter or other kinds of activities which are related to solidarity or to satisfaction of various kinds of personal needs.

The paradox may be stated as follows: an organization must do more than give attention to goal attainment in order to attain its goals. A useful approach is that suggested by the Parsonian functional imperatives.* Whether one is prepared to agree that these and no other imperatives exist, they do represent an attempt, based on Bales' work as a matter of fact, to state a set of conditions necessary for system survival. As such they apply directly to organizations. It is noteworthy that only one of the system imperatives is goal attainment. The names given to the other imperatives are adaptation, integration, and pattern-maintenance and tension management. The import of these categories is that a good part of any system's energies must be given over to activities that do not contribute in any direct sense to goal attainment but rather are concerned essentially with maintaining the system itself.

Such considerations lead directly into the general problem of what economists speak of as "suboptimization." By the latter is meant the tendency of the various units in an organization to exaggerate the importance of their own contribution and to begin to think of the whole organization in terms of the goals of the particular unit in which they are associated. Thus, in a large firm, the head of a section which is concerned with providing rivets which are used in a manufacturing operation in the firm begins to think of the making of rivets as an end in itself. Such an attitude can come very close to the notion of bureaucratic personality. A person then may become so concerned with the importance of making rivets that he can easily forget that rivets are essentially a means for making some product which requires rivets. Yet it is absolutely essential that persons who are given the responsibility of making rivets should begin to believe that rivets are the most important thing in the world.* It is essential that they give their full attention to making rivets, rather than to the question of what rivets contribute to the overall organization whatever that may be. We come here to something close to a craft or professional orientation. One of the functions of providing the craftsman or professional with independence is to free him from the necessity of having to be concerned with the uses to which his skills are put so that he can give his full attention to the maximum development of those skills themselves. Only in this manner is it felt that he makes his major contribution.

---

*Talcott Parsons, et. al. (eds.) Theories of Society, op. cit.

In other words an organization must insulate its units from attention to goals other than the particular concerns of those units. This is not to say of course that each unit is to be given its head and that the purposes of an organization are well-served if all members of it are bureaucratic personalities. It is to say, however, that a great deal of attention must be given to activities which may only be indirectly related or even unrelated to organizational goals. We go further in our argument and insist that the same reasoning applies to activities which are wholly of a maintenance character in the sense in which we have been using this term. The same applies, that is, to those activities that are concerned with adaptation, integration, and pattern-maintenance and tention-management. It is important that persons who are concerned with activities that fall in any of these areas should give their whole attention to them so that those activities are carried out as effectively as possible. There is only one way that one can be sure that persons will do a job as well as it can possibly be done and that is to insist that they make ends of such "means" activities. When a means has been made into an end it has then become a goal of the organization.

---

*A comparable situation is present in many universities in which each department tries to out-do all others in its search for resources to take care of its own needs. In such a jungle-like setting, the strong often get stronger as they draw resources from the weak. As we point out below, one of the goals that our respondents were asked to respond to revolved about the question of whether they should try to maintain top quality in all programs in which the university engages. Such an emphasis, in view of limited resources, would seem to invite the war of each against each.

What we are suggesting then is that there are at least two different kinds of goals in organizations, those goals which are reflected in an output of some kind which we will call "output goals", and those goals which are the ends of those who are charged with responsibility for the maintenance activities, which we will call "support goals". For our convenience we may subdivide the support goals using the general categories that Parsons has suggested for the functional imperatives.

OUTPUT AND SUPPORT GOALS: THE CASE OF THE UNIVERSITY

The approach suggested emerged from difficulties encountered in a study of the goals of American universities. The study was concerned with the question of whether academic administrators of universities see the goals of the university in a manner any different from the teaching, research, and service faculties. It was necessary to specify the goals with some precision since it was desired to survey a large number of administrators and faculties in some 80 universities. It was felt that an open-ended question would not be filled in or be filled in with vague statements. Consequently we were faced with the task of making a list of university goals. Our task was made difficult by the fact that there seems little question that universities have many goals, some of which may be contradictory, and that universities have goals of which many persons are unaware. Nevertheless, based on the rather scant literature, an attempt was made to define these goals. It was early discovered that a great many activities went on in universities other than what many persons would identify as "goals," but which had become goals of the organization. It is essential to repeat we are not speaking of personal goals nor of what the individual desires the goals of the organization to be. We are speaking of goals for the organization as a whole whether the participants desire those goals or not.

Two kinds of evidence are necessary before one can confidently assert that a goal is present: intentions and activities. By "intentions" we understand what, in the participants' view, the organization is trying to do. That is, what they believe the goals of the organization to be, what they feel are its aims or the direction in which it is moving as an organization. Intentions will involve verbal statements of inferences that may be made from symbolic acts, gestures and other types of meaningful acts. By "activities" we understand what persons in the organization are in fact observed to be doing, how they are spending their time, how resources are being allotted. Such an approach derives from a simple kind of analysis suggested by the analogy of the goal of a person who is moving towards the open door of a room. In order to conclude that this person's goal is "to go through the open doorway," two kinds of evidence would seem to be necessary. First, we might ask him what it is that he intends to do and then he might reply that he intends to walk through the doorway. It is possible of course that he is lying to us or that he is not really sure what he intends to do himself. Hence, in addition to this statement, we will also observe his behavior. If his behavior, if continued, would seem to have a high probability of moving him toward the door and if he seems to be looking towards the door and moving his feet in a direction oriented to the door then we may reasonably safely conclude that such indeed is his goal.

On the other hand both intentions and activities must be clearly distinguished from outputs. By the latter we refer to what the organization produces or distributes to persons or systems outside of itself. In the case of the university there may be a strong consensus that a major university goal is the launching of students into useful careers (an intention), but faculty may be observed to be spending much of their time in extension teaching instead (an activity), and a high proportion of the student body (comparatively) may go on to get degrees in liberal arts (an output). Thus there is no necessary correspondence between these three measures. Before one can confidently speak of a goal one needs to have some degree of correspondence between intentions and activities. On the other hand evidence with references to outputs does not necessarily refer to goal activity as such but rather to the organizations relative success in goal attainment. Besides, an organization produces unintended outputs or by-products which may or may not be related to its intention.

In spite of the desirability of including data on activities, and separating them from outputs, it did not prove possible to do so. Because of the large number of universities in our sample, we found that the data supplied to us on activities and outputs was too highly variable and non-comparable to be of use. Some universities keep careful records of how professors spend their time; others regard even asking the question as an interference with academic freedom. In other cases, data were good but only for certain years. The attempt to secure job descriptions of all staff resulted in material of highly varied quality, but most of it required supplementation by personal interview. Since we had close to 10,000 respondents, even sampling would have not been feasible. In the end, we gave up the attempt to secure such data.

Our goal data, then, are based solely on statements of goal intentions. We do not, however, believe that these data are likely to be far off in their relationship to goals, for the following reasons:

(1) First, as we shall see, we ask each person to state first whether he thinks a given goal *is* important at this university. Then, in the following line on the questionnaire, he is asked whether he thinks it *should be* an important goal. In this manner, there is some protection against the likelihood that he will give simply his own feelings about the matter. He is giving his perception.

(2) We only decide that a given goal is of any degree of importance at a university by taking the average of the perceptions of all respondents at that university -- both faculty and administrators. Each person is asked to check a response indicating his perception of its importance. The response is then scored on a scale from 1 to 5. If the overall average is, say, 2.3, then a standard deviation is calculated. We decided only to include the goal if the standard deviation was less than 1. That is, only if there is relatively high consensus on the degree of importance of the goal. A given respondent may be cut off from opportunities to observe the actual importance of a goal. But not everyone is, and it is a fair assumption that the average is a reasonable estimate of what the goal really is. One can, of course, quote Samuel Johnson's famous remark that an average of the opinions of gossipers is still gossip, but we do not believe we are in the presence of gossip. We do not ask for opinions, but for perceptions. In effect, we ask Professor X or Dean Y ~~and~~ at the University of A to act as our eyes. We say: "We cannot come to the University of A to check on how you actually spend your time. So we ask you to look for us and give us a report on what you have seen". The procedure can, perhaps, be more fairly compared to ask~~ed~~ing several astronomers each to look through a telescope, and then each report what they have seen. We ask for

consensus, not because we are sure that the average is near the truth, but that the possibility that it is a more reliable guide has a higher probability than the possibility that most will be far off, and only a few on target.

(3) A third reason for confidence in the correspondence between goal intentions and goals is that our respondents, are, after all, full-time employees of the university they are asked to report on. Further, since we tried for a 10% sample of faculty and all administrators, we have the perceptions of persons situated all over the university. Their combined view should be reasonably close to accuracy. It is essential to remember that we are not talking about their beliefs on what should be the goals, but what they believe they actually are, based on what they have seen.

GOAL INTENTIONS

As indicated above we have found it useful to describe the goals of a university in terms of the categories which Parsons and others have used in describing the functional imperatives of social systems. However, we have modified the names which Parsons and his associates and students have used in favor of a set of terms which apply directly to organizations. Our efforts resulted in the identification of a total of 47 goals but in spite of this large number we do not mean to imply that the list is comprehensive. They are intended to sample the several major categories which we employ. In addition, it must be borne in mind that they are meant to describe the goals of universities only. It must further be borne in mind that it is expected that all of these will be present as a goal to some extent in every university. Their importance as goals will, however, vary. By observing those particular goals which are ranked highest we shall in fact emerge with a goal structure for each university. We have classified the goals under five main headings: Output goals, Adaptation goals, Management goals, Motivation goals, and Positional goals.*

*The list of goals which follows were actually asked in a format which began as follows. One of the great issues in American education has to do with the proper aims or goals of the university. The question is: What are we trying to accomplish? Are we trying to prepare people for jobs, to broaden them intellectually, or what? Below we have listed a large number of the more commonly claimed aims, intentions or goals of a university. We would like you to react to each of these in three different ways:

(1) How important is each aim at your university.

(2) How important should the aim be.

(3) Finally, at the extreme right-hand of the page, record the degree of success you believe the university is in actuality showing toward achieving each aim, intention or goal (circle one of good, fair or poor).

EXAMPLE:

	of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know or can't say	success
to serve as substitute parents	is should be	is should be	[✓ is] should be	is should be	is [✓ should be]	( )	good [✓ fair] poor

A person who had circled the alternatives in the manner shown above would be expressing his perception that the aim, intention or goal, "to serve as substitute parents", is of medium importance at his university but that he believes it should be of no importance as an aim, intention, or goal of his university. He further believes the university is showing fair success in trying to serve as substitute parents.

(A) OUTPUT GOALS.

Output goals are those goals of the University which are reflected, immediately or in the future, in some product, service, skill or orientation which will affect(and is intended to affect) that society.

1. Student-Expressive: Those goals which are reflected in the attempt change the student's identity or character in some fundamental way.

   1.1 Produce a student who, whatever else may be done to him, has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum.

   1.2 Produce a well-rounded student, that is one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual and esthetic potentialities have all been cultivated.

   1.3 Make sure the student is permanently affected (in mind and spirit) by the great ideas of the great minds of history.

   1.4 Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically.

   1.5 Develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices.

2. Student-Instrumental: Those goals which are reflected in the student's being equipped to do something specific for the society into which he will be entering, or to operate in a specific way in that society.

   2.1 Prepare students specifically for useful careers.

   2.2 Provide the student with skills, attitudes, contacts, and experiences which maximize the likelihood of his occupying a high status in life and a position of leadership in society.

   2.3 Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research, and/or creative endeavor.

   2.4 Make a good consumer of the student -- a person who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and can make good consumption choices.

   2.5 Produce a student who is able to perform his citizenship responsibilities effectively.

3. Research: Those goals which reflect the dedication to produce new knowledge or solve problems.

   3.1 Carry on pure research.

   3.2 Carry on applied research.

4. Direct Service: Those goals which reflect the provision of services directly to the population outside of the university in any continuing sense (that is, not faculty, full-time students, or its own staffs). These services are provided because the university, as an organization, is better equipped than any other organization to provide these services.

    4.1 Provide special training for part-time adult students, through extension courses, special short courses, correspondence courses, etc.

    4.2 Assist citizens directly through extension programs, advice, consultation, and the provision of useful or needed facilities and services other than teaching.

    4.3 Provide cultural leadership for the community through university-sponsored programs in the arts, public lectures by distinguished persons, athletic events, and other performances, displays or celebrations which present the best of culture, popular or not.

    4.4 Serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas that will change the society, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts, or politics.

    4.5 Serve as a center for the preservation of the cultural heritage.

(B) ADAPTATION GOALS

Those goals which reflect the need for the organization to come to terms with the environment in which it is located. These revolve about the need to attract students and staff, to finance the enterprise, secure needed resources, and validate the activities of the university with those persons or agencies in a position to affect them.

1. Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially (other than students and recipients of services) to the finances and other material resource needs of the university.

2. Ensure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs we offer (validating groups include accrediting bodies, professional societies, scholarly peers at other universities, and respected persons in intellectual or artistic circles).

3. Educate to his utmost capacities every high school graduate who meets basic legal requirements for admission.

4. Accommodate only students of high potential in terms of the specific strengths and emphases of this university.

5. Orient ourselves to the satisfaction of the special needs and problems of the immediate geographical region.

6. Keep costs down as low as possible through more efficient utilization of time, and space, reduction of course duplication, etc.

7. Hold our staff in the face of inducements offered by other universities.

(C) MANAGEMENT GOALS

Those goals which reflect decisions on who should run the university, the need to handle conflict, and the establishment of priorities on which output goals are to be given maximum attention.

1. Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, perquisites and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to his own profession or discipline.

2. Involve faculty in the government of the university.

3. Involve students in the government of the university.

4. Make sure the university is run democratically insofar as that is feasible.

5. Keep harmony between departments or divisions of the university when such departments or divisions do not see eye to eye on important matters.

6. Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, perquisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to the functioning of this university.

7. Emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program.

8. Encourage students to go into graduate work.

9. To make sure the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible.

10. Make sure that on all important issues, (not only curriculum) the will of the full-time faculty shall prevail.

(D) MOTIVATION GOALS

Those goals which seek to ensure a high level of satisfaction on the part of staff and students, and which emphasize loyalty to the university as a whole.

1. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.

2. Make this a place in which faculty have maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a manner satisfactory to them by their own criteria.

3. Provide a full round of student activities.
4. Protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in.
5. Protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind, and any attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals.
6. Develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the university, rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns
7. Develop greater pride on the part of faculty, staff and students in their university and the things it stands for.

(E.) POSITIONAL GOALS

Goals which serve to help maintain the position of this university in terms of the kind of place it is in comparison to other universities, and in the face of attempts or trends which could change its position.

1. Maintain top quality in all programs we engage in.
2. Maintain top quality in these programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards).
3. Maintain a balanced level of quality across the whole range of programs we engage in.
4. Keep up to date and responsive.
5. Increase the prestige of the university or, if you believe it is already extremely high, ensure maintenance of that prestige.
6. Keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphases and point of view, its "character".

It is quite clear from the above list that the description of the goals of a university is no simple matter. We will expect, as stated above, that universities may be distinguished in terms of average estimates made by the members of each university such that, for example, a particular university may be said to be one which ranks high on, say, some 4 or 5 of this list, moderately high on another 15. Another university may rank high on a different set of 4 and moderately high on a different set of 15.

From the list, it can be seen that less than half of the goals are related to the outputs of the university. It is, however, these outputs that most persons have in mind when they use the word "goal" and it is the Mertonian emphasis which would suggest that activities are suspect unless they have something to do with output goals. yet is is our contention that the goals called adaptation, management, motivation, and positional are goals in the same sense in which output goals

3. Provide a full round of student activities.
4. Protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in.
5. Protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind, and any attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals.
6. Develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the university, rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns
7. Develop greater pride on the part of faculty, staff and students in their university and the things it stands for.

(E.) POSITIONAL GOALS

Goals which serve to help maintain the position of this university in terms of the kind of place it is in comparison to other universities, and in the face of attempts or trends which could change its position.

1. Maintain top quality in all programs we engage in.
2. Maintain top quality in these programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards).
3. Maintain a balanced level of quality across the whole range of programs we engage in.
4. Keep up to date and responsive.
5. Increase the prestige of the university or, if you believe it is already extremely high, ensure maintenance of that prestige.
6. Keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphases and point of view, its "character".

It is quite clear from the above list that the description of the goals of a university is no simple matter. We will expect, as stated above, that universities may be distinguished in terms of average estimates made by the members of each university such that, for example, a particular university may be said to be one which ranks high on, say, some 4 or 5 of this list, moderately high on another 15. Another university may rank high on a different set of 4 and moderately high on a different set of 15.

From the list, it can be seen that less than half of the goals are related to the outputs of the university. It is, however, these outputs that most persons have in mind when they use the word "goal" and it is the Mertonian emphasis which would suggest that activities are suspect unless they have something to do with output goals. yet is is our contention that the goals called adaptation, management, motivation, and positional *are* goals in the same sense in which output goals may be so categorized. They clearly involve an intention or aim for the *university as a whole* and their presence may be reflected in activities. For example, take the case of the adaptation goal numbered B 1-1 ("Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially (other than students and recipients of services) to the finances and other material resource needs of the university.") Such a goal may be ranked moderately high or higher in a great many universities and there may be considerable agreement that it deserves this ranking. Persons may indicate this goal to be a moderately important one by statements which they hear, by statements made in the catalogue or other publications of the university, by the activities of certain members of the administration and perhaps by the general concern of the faculty and others to so behave in public situations as to "represent the university" in an honorable manner. Persons who engage in behavior which secures unfavorable public attention may be criticized by their colleagues as threatening the likelihood of attaining this goal. It is our point, further, that we cannot see any useful purpose served by insisting that this goal is, after all, a *means* which enables the university to then pursue its output goals. This is, of course, true but it is no less a goal for all that. Deliberate attention is given to it for the entire university and the university must move toward it in the same way as it moves toward its goal of giving direct service or teaching students. The same will be true of such management goals as making sure that the university is run democratically, such motivation goals as protecting the faculty's right to academic freedom, and such positional goals as maintaining the character of the university. Indeed, the claim could be that output goals are a *means* for the attainment of positional goals in a sense that only by producing students of a certain kind can the university continue to preserve its peculiar emphasis and point of view, that is, its character.

If we are correct, it is then possible to insist that for the non-output goals to be attained, persons must give a great deal of attention to them, must perceive them as worthy goals, and deliberately engage in activity which will move the organization toward them. A great many persons or a great deal of the time of a great many persons (and perhaps of all persons) will therefore be focused on non-output goals, And they will be bureaucratic personalities. Yet the ability of the organization to move to attain its output goals is completely dependent on those who spend their time in undeviating concentration on the non-output goals.

The problem to which Merton alluded consists consequently not simply in the situation in which means become ends. Our claim is that the success of the organization is absolutely dependent on that process taking place. It is through that process that the intentions and activities which we classify under the headings of adaptation, management, motivation and position have become goals. The type of condition which Merton was concerned about is present when any of the non-output goals are substituted for output goals such that any significant number of persons in the organization begin to give their attention only to the non-output goals. At the same time the type of analysis that we are proposing here points to the existence of types of organizational dysfunctions involving the displacement of goals other than those that are suggested by the notion of bureaucratic personality. Not only may persons substitute non-output goals for output goals (the bureaucratic personality) but the reverse is quite possible. Here we refer to the situation in which persons insist that attention be given only or almost completely to output goals and that the non-output goals be ignored or downgraded. This approach is usually criticized by being spoken of as "unrealistic" or "ivory tower".

Finer distinctions may be made than simply that between output and non-output as suggested by the categories. For example, persons that pay exclusive attention to management goals to the neglect of adaptation goals may be said to have a local orientation and to ignore the place of the university in the community or in the environment in which it must do business or survive. Persons who insist that every attention be given to maintaining the top quality of a particular university may be guilty of what Caplow has called "organizational aggrandizement"* whereas persons who emphasize motivation goals may be perceived as believing that the university exists only to satisfy the needs of those in it rather than to serve the society in which it is located.

---

*See Theodore Caplow, Principles of Organization, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964, pp. 213-216.

We make no special apology for the length of the list. Indeed it is our belief that the study of organizations has suffered from an over-simple view of goals. Most organizations are characterized as having but one goal and many classifications that are available in the literature are based on such simplified views of organizations. We suggest that one of the reasons that such classifications have not been more helpful is that they describe very little about the organizations that they are meant to comprehend. A goal structure would seem to be more descriptive.

Organizations undoubtedly differ in the complexity of their goal structures, with universities being among the more complex. Yet every organization must grapple with adaptation, management, motivation, and positional goals, in addition to its output goals. The university in the United States is probably unique in the number of output goals it has, but its support or maintenance goals may not be particularly complex. A manufacturing organization may have a much shorter list of output goals, but perhaps a longer list of support or maintenance goals, depending on any special management problems it may face, difficulties in securing supplies, or various forms of competition. At the end, its list of goals might turn out to be quite as long as that faced by a university.

Finally, some persons might quarrel with the use of the word "goal" to describe support and maintenance activities. Of course, many maintenance and support activities are not organizational goals. By an organizational goal, as stated above, we understand a state of the organization as a whole toward which the organization is moving, as evidenced by statements persons make (intentions), and activities in which they engage. The most obvious organizational goals are, of course, what we have called "output goals," (making shoes, protecting society from criminals, healing the sick etc.), and it is those kinds of goals that the layman has in mind when he speaks of an organization's goals. Yet it is possible for *anything* to become an organizational goal, even such an activity as repairing broken plumbing, provided it is conceived of as an organizational problem. For example, if repeated breakdowns occurred to the point where it became one of stated targets for the next year to seek funds to put in a new plumbing system, and if persons then were observed to be moving in the direction of saving money, or diverting it to make this possible, then a new organizational goal would have been created. Goals may and do change over time, but *some* kind of adaptation, management, motivation, and positional goals will always be present in every organization. Through the above reasoning and analysis, we secured the 47 goals listed. They were mixed, randomly, and appear as shown in the Appendix~~, A~~ .

(2) The Power Structure of Universities

We predicted that goals would be related to the way in which power is distributed in the university. In addition, we felt confident that that subject in itself would be of interest, as already indicated. We decided to get at power by asking our respondents to indicate who they thought made the big decisions at the university. We did this by asking them whether they thought each of the following persons had "a great deal of say," "quite a bit of say," "some say," "very little say," or "no say at all:" the Regents, legislators, sources of large private grants or endowments, federal government agencies or offices, state government agencies or offices, the President, the vice-president(s) (or provosts), dean of the graduate school, dean of liberal arts, deans of professional schools as a group, chairmen of departments, considered as a group, the faculty, as a group, the students, as a group, parents of students, as a group, the citizens of the state, as a group, and alumni, as a group.* (See Appendix).

(3) Other Questions Included in Questionnaire.

As indicated, we were interested not only in what the individual thought the goals of the university were but in what they should be. This question was asked in combination with the question dealing with goals since this made for a more compact instrument. In each case when the person was asked to indicate how important he thought a given goal actually was, he was also asked to indicate how important he thought it should be. Degrees of divergence between the two were thought to be significant. In a sense this question gets at a set of values or attitudes that the individual has.

We were also interested in the values of personnel with reference to criteria used to judge persons for salary increments and promotions. We therefore asked persons to indicate how important they thought each of the following criteria should be in recommending salary increments and promotions: teaching performance, publications, honors received, student evaluations, other job offers received, service to the community, total effectiveness in working with students, ability to secure research grants, statements of other faculty members, ability to get along with colleagues, research accomplished, research potential, committee and other administrative service.

Finally, we asked the usual background questions dealing with age, sex, education, etc. because we were interested in whether such individual factors made a difference ~~than~~ IN the values that people had with reference to university goals and whether administrators and faculty differed in their conceptions of how the university should be operated.

---

*We also asked questions dealing with whether the respondent felt that the faculty played an important role in each of the following areas of decision-making: educational policies, faculty personnel policies, financial affairs and improvements, student affairs, and public and alumni relations.

In addition, we asked each respondent to indicate whether the following external groups or agencies affect the work that the respondent does in any ways that he could perceive: alumni of the university, agencies supplying funds for contract research, local government, state government (executive), state government (legislative), federal government, accrediting bodies, donors, foundations, churches or religious orders. The analysis of those replies will be presented in forthcoming publications.

The questionnaire (See appendix) also included a number of other questions whose results are not being reported upon here. All of them involved theoretical sociological problems which will be reported on in scholarly journals.

The questionnaire was pretested at the University of Minnesota by giving it to fifty members of the faculty and the administrative staff, asking them to fill it out and to indicate their criticisms of it. The original document was about twice the length of the present document. As a consequence of the pretest, it was shortened to its present length and a number of questions modified. The questionnaire was still of very great length, as is clear by inspecting it. We considered the possibility of breaking it up into parts and sending them out one at a time. However, advice which we received from survey researchers at several universities led us to decide against doing it. The feeling was that it was always difficult to secure a favorable response by mail and that, if a man would respond favorably, it was essential to give him the whole job to do at the time. The chances of getting him to respond several times was low. This of course accounted for ~~from~~ the response rate being lower than we had hoped it might be otherwise.

C. Sample Design and Response

Since we decided to focus on special organizational problems, particularly situations in which there was conflict in goal definition between administrators and the faculty (or where such conflict was likely), and since we were interested in whether such goal conflict was related to the power structure of the university, we decided to restrict our study to educational institutions most likely to exhibit such conflict and the elaboration of such a power structure. One could find many schools (for example, a small, church controlled liberal arts school for men only) in which there may be almost complete consensus of organizational goals and values. Hence, we deliberately excluded all colleges which were dominated by some single point of view or a commitment to a uniform task which is of such a nature as to severely limit the goal variation that can exist. Not included in our original plans, therefore, were church-controlled schools, liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges, and technical training institutions.

Our population consisted of the nondenominational* universities in the United States. It is these universities, with their graduate [illegible] professional schools, that seemed certain to exhibit the kind of goal variation we were interested in. It is further in this kind of educational institutions that the "support functions" are claimed to have increased greatly and in which administrators are often accused of having attained positions of considerable power. The universities are also distinguished by the importance in them of the graduate school and, for our purposes, a graduate school is necessary to provide assurance that the goal of research will be well represented in the university.

The institutions were selected on the basis of the following five criteria:

1. Doctor of Philosophy or equivalent degree must be offered.
2. Ph.D. degree must be granted in at least three of four fields (humanities, biological sciences, physical sciences, and social sciences).
3. Degrees granted in the two least emphasized fields must come to ten percent or more of the total degrees conferred. This provision was designed to overcome any undue concentration in one field, and thus help insure the kind of diversity

---

*Our study also included 9 denominational (mostly Catholic) universities, which fulfilled our test for "university" in all respects. However, preliminary findings suggested strongly that they made up a universe of their own and deserved separate tabulation and analysis. We are not reporting on them here.

of goals that we were interested in.

4. There must be a liberal arts undergraduate school with three or more professional schools.
5. The institution must have conferred ten or more degrees during the years 1962-1963.

We secured the data for making the above decisions from American Colleges and Universities, ninth edition, 1964 (appendix IV and VI).*

It turned out that there were seventy universities defined in this way and we decided to include all but two of them. The two exceptions were the University of Minnesota and the University of Washington since these were the home institutions of the investigators. They were excluded because of the involvement of the investigators in them and because the University of Minnesota was used for pretesting purposes. The list of universities turned out to be substantially equivalent to that used by Berelson (Graduate Education in the United States, pp. 280-281), with denominational, technical, and starred universities excluded) except for the addition of a small number of universities which have attained university status since the time at which the list was drawn up.

The universities are as follows:

1. Alabama
2. Arkansas
3. Arizona
4. Auburn
5. Baylor
6. Boston

---

*Purdue University turned out to be an exception. It was not classified as a university by the editors of that volume, yet it was the feeling of the investigators that it was excluded by a minor technicality. Consequently, it was included. Such places as MIT and Caltech are automatically excluded by our criteria.

7. California (Berkely)
8. California (Los Angeles)
9. Chicago
10. Cincinnati
11. Colorado
12. Columbia
13. Connecticut
14. Cornell
15. Duke
16. Emory
17. Florida
18. Florida State
19 Georgia
20. George Washington
21. Harvard
22. Illinois
23. Indiana
24. Iowa
25. Iowa State
26. Johns Hopkins
27. Kansas
28. Kentucky
29. Louisiana State
30. Maryland
31. New Mexico
32. Michigan
33. Michigan State
34. Missouri
35. Nebraska
36. New York University
37. North Carolina
38. Northwestern
39. Ohio State
40. Oklahoma
41. Oklahoma State
42. Oregon
43. Oregon State
44. Pennsylvania
45. Pennsylvania State
46. Pittsburgh
47. Princeton
48. Purdue
49. Rochester
50. Rutgers
51. Southern California
52. Stanford
53. State University of New York
54. Syracuse
55. Temple
56. Tennessee
57. Texas
58. Tulane
59. Utah
60. Vanderbilt
61. Virginia
62. Washington State
63. Washington University (St. Louis)
64. Wayne State
65. Western Reserve
66. Wisconsin
67. Wyoming
68. Yale

The drawing of the sample presented a number of problems. It was originally thought that we would attempt to secure responses from all administrators (chairmen of departments, deans, vice-presidents, presidents, and their staffs) and from a ten percent sample of the faculty. This approach was followed since it was recognized that the numbers of administrators, although rather large in total, would be small in particular categories. Thus if it were desired, say, to compare deans of medical schools with deans of schools of dentistry, then, since there are only a very small number of each of these persons, it would be necessary to get a very high proportion of them. On the other hand, the number of faculty was expected to be so large that it would not be feasible to attempt to get all of them.

It proved difficult to secure reliable information on the actual number of persons at each university. A careful search of materials available in official documents, both published and mimeographed, was moderately helpful, but even here we found it difficult to secure accurate information on totals. For example it is the practice in most United States government publications to consider chairmen of departments and deans as members of the faculty. Consequently we were unable to secure an accurate measure even of the total number of administrators. At the end we were forced to gather this information ourselves. This we did by writing to each university, asking for personnel information. In most cases this information had not been collated and therefore it became necessary for us to do it ourselves. We endeavored to secure from each university a copy of its catalogues, its telephone directory, and other information that would give us data on the personnel in the university. In general the response was good and we secured at least catalogue information from most universities. In two cases the material did not seem to be useful or reliable but fortunately equivalent information happened to be available on these universities from the library of the University of Minnesota. In some cases the material was forthcoming only after considerable effort by the investigators. It became necessary in one case to write to friends at one university and ask them to telephone the registrar and ask him to respond to our request for information.

After this material was received, it still was necessary to spend a great deal of time evaluating it. Universities differ in the way they classify persons in their catalogues. One category that proved particularly difficult was that of personnel in Medical Schools. Some universities only include on the faculty of their medical schools persons who are full-time residents on the campus, counting all others as clinical staff. Others (although they very likely make the distinction in practice) include everyone that has any connection with the medical school including graduate assistants and part-time clinical assistants, as members of the faculty. It is impossible simply from the catalogue to get information on who has a full-time or permanent attachment and who has not. It became necessary in a large number of cases to write to the institution for further information.

Frequently, also, we ran into the problem of names being repeated in different parts of the catalogue, if they had multiple affiliations. The problem of drawing up the original sample list took a good deal longer as a consequence than had originally been planned and required a larger staff than had originally been planned for as well. There also were differences between universities in the date of the material, some places having the material that had just been published while in other cases we were forced to work with data that might be two years old. When the latter was the case, we endeavored to update the list by making use of current telephone directories from the university. Even after the replies started coming in, it became necessary to revise the original list since persons might have died or left the university between the time in which we made up our list and the time in which the questionnaires went out.

On the basis of the best information we were able to get, there were in the spring of 1964, the following numbers in the 68 universities:

Administrators: 8,828
Faculty: 67,560

We then went ahead and took a ten percent sample of the faculty so that the size of the faculty sample was 6,756. This brought the total number to 8,828 plus 6,756; that is to 15,584.

From the very beginning we had to face the general problem of mailed questionnairs--a low response rate. It is the experience of survey researchers that a response rate of about 16% is not at all unusual and if the questionnaire is long it is difficult to push it up much above that. Such is particularly the case when one attempts a national sample study. In addition, we had a very long questionnaire. Some of our respondents wrote us that they had spent three hours or more answering it. It was very difficult to finish it in under an hour or an hour and a half. We recognized that there would be strong resistance to taking so much time. We therefore employed a number of devices to stimulate high response level. First we solicited the assistance of accrediting bodies and professional associations to lend their support to the study. A number of these organizations agreed to let us use their names and in addition agreed to refer favorably to the study in their own literature which went out to their own membership. Second, a study on the role perceptions of deans of schools of business administration had been completed by the Principal Investigators in 1961. Of the 101 member deans of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, they secured responses to a detailed, open-ended mail questionnaire from ninety. The results were presented to the annual meetings of the Association in 1962. Some of the ninety deans who responded--representing, of course, ninety universities--agreed to offer their support in securing contacts with other administrators in their universities. Third, the President of the University of Minnesota, Meredith Wilson, kindly agreed to write letters for us to his fellow presidents at all of the universities. In this letter he mentioned his own personal interest in the study and urged them to fill out the questionnaire.

We also felt that account must be taken of the fact that our population consisted, after all, of literate persons who are accustomed to working with paper and to filling out questionnaires. Indeed, some of them are all too accustomed to it, since they receive a large number of questionnaires to fill out.*

Our response rate is indicated on the Table below.

Table 1

Response Rate
(usable questionnaires)

	Administrators	Faculty	TOTAL
Respondents	4,494	2,730	7,224
Non-Respondents	4,334	4,026	8,360
TOTAL	8,828	6,756	15,584
Percent Response	50.9	40.4	46.4

On the whole we were quite pleased with the level of response. The response rate was much higher than is the usual case in mail questionnaires and particularly questionnaires of the length of ours. As we had predicted, the response rate for administrators was somewhat better than that for faculty. We had thought that administrators would be more highly motivated since they would be more interested in the purposes of the study and in addition had available secretarial and other help to assist them in making the questionnaire out and returning it.

The question arises as to whether the group responded was a biased one or not. On the face of it there would seem to be little reason, except for the sheer time that it took to fill out the questionnaire, why a person would not fill in and return the questionnaire. Some persons are opposed to questionnaires as such (a prominent university president wrote us that he was "constitutionally opposed to all questionnaires") and particularly is this likely to be the case when a man is being asked to spend from one and a half to three hours of his time without pay. One member of our sample, a professor of medicine, wrote us that he was accustomed to receiving $25 an hour for his work. He therefore said he would be happy to fill out the questionnaire at that rate. Whether people who do not have the time or do not wish to take the time to fill out questionnaires are biased in their views in some way is difficult to show and on the whole we do not believe it to be true. Inspection of patterns of response suggested further that there were no particular gaps that suggested that some important group was not being heard from. When we compared universities by control, the response rate in the public universities was better than in the private. In the public universities the average response was 51.6 percent whereas in the private it was 41.8 percent. This is not a large difference, but still suggests that persons in private universities were less willing to fill out the questionnaire. This fits in with our predictions that persons at state universities would tend, as shown by their response to the goal questions, to the more strongly service oriented, and to be more likely to be responsive to requests for assistance from the community as well as from outside sources. When we examined the patterns of response by major administrative categories, there was some variation but again it was not great. The overall response rate for administrators was 50.9 percent as already stated. When we broke down the administrators, their response rates were as follows:

---

*To our surprise we heard from the president of a university which was not on our list expressing concern. In effect he asked why his college had not been chosen, feeling slighted. It may be that one way in which colleges become recognized as universities is that they join the circuit of places to which questionnaires are sent.

Presidents--42.2%
Vice-Presidents, academic,--56.4%
Vice-Presidents, non-academic--41.6%

Academic Deans--51.6%
Non-academic Deans--52.5%
Directors--49.5%
Chairmen--51.1%

In general, as may be seen, the percentages were close to the overall average of 50.9 percent. The only one deviating appreciably was that of presidents, which was again predictable. The chief executive of the university is a very busy man, as are the people in his office, and we felt it to be expected that they would not respond at quite the same rate as others.

We did make an effort to make an analysis of a unique kind which if successful would have given us a conclusive answer to the question of whether the sample was in fact a biased one or not. We took all of the non-respondents and drew a random sample of 200 persons from the list. We then wrote special letters to these 200 asking them to respond solely for the purposes of serving as a control. We recognized that for this technique to work we would have to get practically all 200. Securing 100% samples is extremely difficult under the best of conditions and practically always requires personal interviewing. Nevertheless, we decided to try it. Our thought was that if we secured all or practically all of this group we would then compare their responses question by question with those of our respondents. Unfortunately, the response rate came to about the same as it had been for earlier attempts.

In conclusion, we feel confident that we did in fact secure as wide a response as was possible given the special conditions we were working under. We sent out the questionnaire at what turned out to be a bad time namely just before commencement in 1964. This is a time when most administrators, as well as faculty, are busy with final examinations, grading, and commencement. We then found ourselves in the summer when many potential respondents are simply not on campus. This was evident from the many letters from secretaries apologizing for the absence of their bosses and agreeing to bring it to their attention when they return. One result was that questionnaires kept coming in for some months and, indeed, for as long as a year after the original group had gone out. Nevertheless, six weeks after the first questionnaires were sent out we sent a post-card follow-up reminding the person that we had not heard from him as yet. Approximately three months later a second mailing of questionnaires to all non-respondents went out. Some respondents, therefore, were contacted four times in all. Many respondents responded after personal pleas. The principal investigators themselves wrote a large number of letters to persons responding to their questions about the study.

It is our belief that our group is not strongly biased in their ideas, at least not in ways that would be related to the purposes of the study. It is possible, however, that some persons might claim that among those who we did not hear from who offered no explanation for their failure to respond would be some, perhaps a small group, who are opposed in principle to questionnaires as a way of gathering knowledge. We received a small number of letters from persons who said this was how they felt. It is conceivable that persons who are opposed to questionnaires as a way of gathering knowledge may also be persons who believe the goals of the university should be different than what others do. We do not know of any data to support this claim but it is conceivable for example that persons who are opposed to questionnaires are opposed to the study of human behavior because they do not believe it can be studied scientifically. If that is the case, they may have some feelings about the teaching of social sciences in universities, feeling that such studies may have some place as a humanity but not as a science. Although we did not state this particular point of view as one of the goals of the university, it is possible that it may be correlated with those that see the university as a place which should spend its time in scientific matters or in attempting to or emphasizing intellective matters rather than service to the community for example. This is possible although doubtful, but if there is a bias in operating in our data, we speculated it may be of this sort. It may be then that our results do not reflect as much as they might have the feelings of those who see the university as primarily a place in which research and possibly what we have called student expressive goals are important. On the other hand, as we shall point out in our discussion of findings, so many of our findings "make sense" in the sense of fitting together or as forming or as having internal consistency that it is hard to believe there is any consistent bias operating.

D. Techniques of Analysis

When a questionnaire was received, (after the appropriate control number was checked off), the questionnaire was coded, and the information was transferred to punch cards. The cards were then converted to tape for analysis. An IBM 7090-7094 computer was employed.

There are two fundamental kinds of analysis that were made, one which we called "individual" and one which we called "organizational". An individual analysis is one in which some attribute of an individual is related to some other attribute. For example, there may be interest in whether administrators differ in social class origin from faculty. For example, do administrators in general tend to come from a higher social class than faculty? (We found that this was not the case). An organizational relationship, on the other hand, is one in which we conceive of the university itself as a single individual. We therefore may deal with two attributes of the university as a whole, such as its size or location. For example, do universities in the East tend to be larger than universities in the West? The greater part of our analysis and the greater part of this report deals with organizational relationships largely because what is original or unique about this study is the large number of universities it deals with. Although 68 in itself is not a large number, it is certainly larger than most organizational studies employ. In order to clarify the concept of an organizational relationship, we present below a portion of the instructions (modified for clarity of understanding) to the research staff and to the programming staff on how these are to be calculated for our major measures.*

Instructions To Computer Staff

Organizational Relationships

An "organizational relationship" is defined as one in which the university is conceived of as a single individual. Measures consist of single figures such as means or percentages, or ranks which characterize the university as a whole. An example is size of university as measured by number of full-time faculty members or the prestige of the university, as measured by a scale from 1 through 5. In this case, an organizational relationship might be the following: the more prestigious the university, the larger the university. A dummy table for examining this relationship would be:

		Prestige				
		1	2	3	4	5
	Small					
Size	Medium					
	Large					

N 68

Gamma:

Z:

A good many of the organizational variables are averages drawn from the questionnaire. For example, question 2.1 asks the respondent to indicate who thinks "make the big decisions" at his university. He is to check the appropriate spaces, as shown below:

	a great deal of say	quite a bit of say	some say	very little say	no say at all
The regents (or trustees)	____	____	___	_____	___
Legislators	____	____	___	_____	___
Sources of large private grants or endowments	____	____	___	_____	___
Federal government offices or agencies	____	____	___	_____	___

:

etc.

---

*This material is only illustrative. We did not actually carry out all analysis listed in this example.

At a given university, the average score may be used to characterize the power of the indicated persons or groups, at that university. We present, for example, the replies dealing with "The regents (or trustees)" for the University of Chicago and Ohio State University:

	a great deal of say	quite a bit of say	some say	very little say	no say at all
University of Chicago	46	40	30	5	1
Ohio State University	148	45	8	2	1

As is clear, both universities show skewed distributions since we find that Regents tend to be highly rated everywhere. Nevertheless, the comparative differences are large. The weighted arithmetic mean is to be calculated in each case. We assign a weight of 5 for "a great deal of say"; 4 for "quite a bit of say", 3 for "some say" and so forth.

As can be readily calculated, the results are:

University of Chicago	4.02
Ohio State University	4.67

We also obtain a measure of degree of agreement (not discussed here).

The measures are to be calculated for all universities, and the scores are to be ranged in order from lowest to highest. The distribution is then to be divided into thirds (in manner to be described). The thirds will be called "high", "medium" and "low". If the University of Chicago score falls in the lower third, then we will say that the power of the regents there is "low". If Ohio State University's score falls in the middle third, we will say that the power of the regents there is "medium."*

In this way, we will obtain a score for all 68 universities which will enable us to rate a university as high, medium, or low on the power of the regents. We will then relate the power of regents to some other university characteristic, for example, size, as shown in the following dummy table:

---

*The University of Chicago's score did fall in the bottom third. Ohio State's fell in the top third and was, hence, referred to as "high".

			Size		
		Small	Medium	Large	
Power of Regents	Low				23
	Medium				22
	High				23
		23	22	23	Total = 68

As explained elsewhere, we shall make use of Goodman and Kruskal's "gamma" as our measure of the size of the relationship, and use a modified form of the "z" measure which they suggest for a test of significance. The computer is programmed for both of these measures.*

---

*When we used the number of full-time staff as our measure of size of university, the results enable us to fill in this dummy table as follows:

			Size		
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Power of Regents	Low	5	8	10	23
	Medium	8	6	8	22
	High	10	8	5	23
	Total	23	22	23	68

Gamma = -0.283 Z = -1.156

We made use of the 5% level of significance, requiring a z of 1.96 or higher. As will be seen, we only report findings (with the obtained gammas) when the findings are significant. Hence the above finding is not reported in the body of our report For what it may be worth, the above table suggests that there is a negative relationship between size and power of regents. That is, as the size of the university increases, the power of the regents goes down (or at least, is perceived to go down). The size of the relationship is shown by the gamma to be realtively strong. The z, being below 1.96, suggests that such a gamma could come up by chance a good deal more often than 5 times in a hundred. (About 25 times in 100). As we shall show, contrary to the beliefs of many who blame the size of the university for its troubles, we found that size was associated with very few of the characteristics of the university that we investigated.

The following measures are to be calculated for each university:

1. Goal Measure 1 (GM 1)

This measure is derived from a ranking of the weighted means of "goal is" responses. For GI-HOLD OUR STAFF (CD/COL 11), at the University of Kansas, we get:

ABSOL	GREAT	MED	LITTLE	NONE	TOTAL
5	55	51	11	2	124

If we set scores of "4" for ABSOL, "3" for GREAT, etc., then the weighted mean comes to 2.3. We next calculate the standard deviation for this mean. It comes to a trifl over 1.0. We set a rule (for now--to be discussed) that the standard deviation must not exceed 1.5. If it does, we call the goal "confused," and so treat it from then on. In this case, the goal is not confused, so we may use the weighted mean as a measure of its importance.

We then calculate the weighted mean for GI-HOLD OUR STAFF at each of the 68 universities. Then we range the means in sequence from the lowest to the highest, cut the distribution in approximately 3 equal parts, call the top group "high", the next "medium," and the bottom group "low." In the case of the University of Kansas, the weighted mean of 2.3 might have fallen in the "medium" category. This, then, is Goal Measure 1 for GI-HOLD OUR STAFF at the University of Kansas. In all calculations involving GI-HOLD OUR STAFF, Goal Measure 1 for Kansas is "medium."

2. Goal Measure 2 (GM 2)

Use the weighted mean, as in GM 1. In this case, draw up a distribution of all the "goal is" means at the University of Kansas. For GI-HOLD OUR STAFF, the mean is 2.3; for GI-WILL OF FACULTY (CD 1/COL 13), the mean of 1.9, etc. split into thirds. Perhaps the mean of 2.3 now falls into the "high" category at the University of Kansas. This goal (HOLD OUR STAFF) is now called "high," and is Goal Measure 2 for this goal.

3. Goal Measure 3 (GM 3)

All "goal is" questions are grouped into eight categories:

a. student-instrumental (SI)
b. student-expressive (SE)
c. research
d. service
e. adaptation
f. management
g. motivation
h. positional

The classification is on the following pages (entitled UNIVERSITY GOALS). Go back to weighted means as calculated in GM 1. Exclude means called "confused." Then calculate for all the student-instrumental "goal is" questions an arithmetic mean of the weighted means at the university. Call this arithmetic mean the "student-instrumental mean" at the university. Arrange student-instrumental means at all 68 universities in a sequence from low to high, split in thirds, and call top "high," middle "medium" and bottom "low." The category "high," "medium," or "low" is Goal Measure 3 for each university. There will be a similar measure for "student-expressive," "research," etc.

4. Goal Measure 4 (GM 4)

Take the "student-instrumental mean" calculated for a given university; then take the "student-expressive mean," the "research mean," the "service mean," etc., and arrange these eight arithmetic means in sequence from low to high at that university. Here you will have only eight means. Split them in half, calling them "low" and "high." These categories are Goal Measure 4.

5. Goal Measure 6 (GM 6)

Take the "student-instrumental," "student-expressive," etc. means. Calculate a single mean for what are called "output goals" and for what are called "support goals." Output goals include student-instrumental, student-expressive, research and service. Support goals include all the rest. It is practically certain that at each university the output goal mean will be larger than the support goal mean. Range all universities in sequence on output goal means, from low to high, and split the distribution in thirds, called "low," "medium" and "high." Do the same for support goals. These are both Goal Measure 6.

6. Goal Measure 7 (GM 7)

Calculate the arithmetic mean of the student-instrumental and student-expressive "goal is" questions at a university. Call this "student emphasis mean." Range all universities in order, split into thirds, called low, medium and high. This is Goal Measure 7.

7. Goal Value Measure 1 (GVM 1)

The following Goal Value measures are calculated in the same way as the corresponding Goal Measures, except that in each case we use the answer to the "should be" part of the question. Hence, for the University of Kansas, we have the following figures for GS-HOLD OUR STAFF (CD 1/COL 12):

ABSOL	23
GREAT	71
MED	21
LITTLE	7
NONE	2

Calling ABSOL 4, etc., the mean comes to 2.5. These means are arranged in sequence for all 68 universities, split into thirds, and called low, medium, and high. This is Goal Value Measure 1.

8. Goal Value Measure 2 (GVM 2)

As for GM 2, but with GS scores.

9. Goal Value Measure 3 (GVM 3)

As for GM 3, but with GS scores.

10. Goal Value Measure 4 (GVM 4)

As for GM 4, but with GS scores.

11. Goal Value Measure 6 (GVM 6)

As for GM 6, but with GS scores.

12. Goal Value Measure 7 (GVM 7)

As for GM 7, but with GS scores.

13. Power Structure Measure 1 (PSM 1)

Calculated in a manner similar to GM 1. For DECIDE REGENTS (CD3/COL 11) the sources are:

GREAT	69
Q.ABIT	42
SOME	13
LITTLE	1
NONE	0

If we call GREAT, 4, Q.ABIT 3, etc., then the weighted mean is 3.4. Range all 68 universities in sequence, split weighted mean distribution into thirds, call them high, medium, and low. This is PSM 1 for Regents. Perform similar operations to obtain PSM 1 scores for legislators, sources of large private grants or endowments, etc.

14. Power Structure Measure 2 (PSM 2)

Calculated in a manner similar to GM 2. Here the weighted means for each power group (regents, legislators, etc.) at a given university are ranged in order at the university. Split into thirds, call low, medium, and high. Then the university is characterized as one in which regents are rated high in power in comparison to others at the university. (If the score of 3.4 is in the high group at the university).

15. Power Structure Measure 4 (PSM 4)

Take weighted means calculated for PSM 1. Average these means for outside and inside powerholders at a university.

Outside: Regents, legislators, sources of grants, federal govt., state government, parents, citizens, alumni.

Inside: President, vice-president, graduate school dean, liberal arts dean, professional school dean, chairman of departments, faculty, students.

There will thus be two averages -- one for outside and one for inside. Compare these two averages. Possibilities are: outside higher than inside, same, inside higher than outside. These three possibilities make up Power Structure Measure 4.

16. Power Structure Measure 5 (PSM 5)

Take weighted means calculated for PSM 1 for the administrators only. Secure arithmetic mean. Administrators are: president, vice-president, dean of graduate school, dean of liberal arts, deans of professional schools, chairmen. Range all 68 universities in order, etc. as usual.

17. Power Structure Measure 6 (PSM 6)

Take average of administrators secured in PSM 5. Compare to weighted mean for faculty, as secured in PSM 1. Categorize as: average of administrators exceeds mean for faculty, same, mean for faculty exceeds average for administrators. This is PSM 6 for the university.

18. Power Structure Measure 8 (PSM 8)

Use weighted means calculated for PSM 1, and find overall arithmetic mean of president, vice-president, deans, chairmen, and faculty. Range in order for 68 universities, etc. This is PSM 8.

19. Power Structure Measure 9 (PSM 9)

Use weighted means calculated for PSM. Find overall arithmetic mean of those means at a university. Range in order for 68 universities, etc. This is PSM 9.

20. Area of Decisions Measure 1 (CD 3/COL 27, et seq.)

Calculate weighted mean of AREA EDUC POLICY, AREA FAC POLICY, AREA FINANCE, AREA STUD AFFAIRS, and AREA PUBLIC-ALUM for each university. Range each in sequence from high to low for all 68 universities, categorize as high, medium, and low. This is Area of Decisions Measure 1. There will be one such measure for AREA EDUC POLICY, AREA FAC POLICY, etc.

21. Area of Decisions Measure 2 (CD 3/COL 27, et seq)

Like Area of Decisions Measure 1, except the weighted means of AREA EDUC POLICY, AREA FAC POLICY, etc. are ranged in sequence from high to low at a given university. Split the range of 5 weighted means in two--high and low. If AREA EDUC POLICY falls in the high category at the university in question, then that is the category of university on AREA EDUC POLICY for Area of Decisions Measure 2.

22. Influence of External Groups -- Measure 1

Proceed as in Area of Decisions-Measure 1.

23. Influence of External Groups -- Measure 2

Proceed as in Area of Decisions-Measure 2.

Other Measures Employed

A number of other organizational measures were also employed, which, in contrast to those described, are referred to as "global" measures. The previous measures are essentially averages, based on individual data. Thus we have the average opinion on some subject, or the average degree of emphasis on a goal. There are also measures which, however, are not derived from the individuals in the organization but are simply attributes of the organization as a whole, such as the prestige of the university, its region, or its location. We employed the following global measures:

1. Type Control.

   We distinguished private from state controlled universities.

2. Size.

   We have two measures of size, one based on size of staff and one based on number of students. They are not the same and are not very closely correlated.

3. Productivity.

   We employed here the number of doctorates and the amount of contract research in dollars, which the university was carrying on.

4. Quality.

   We employed a complex measure of prestige whose calculation is described below. We included also as a secondary measure of prestige the number of volumes in the library.

5. Emphasis on graduate work.

   This measure was secured by counting the proportion of all students who are taking graduate work.

C

6. Region and location (rural and urban).

Prestige of Universities

Since this measure turns out to be of the first importance in universities, we employed particular care in calculating it. Our measure is based essentially on the study carried out by the American Counsil of Education (Allen Cartter, An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education)* This was a survey of opinion in which a sample of persons in university arts and science departments and engineering departments, which give the Ph.D. were asked to rate departments in quality, checking one of the headings, "distinguished", "strong", "good", "adequate", "marginal", or "not sufficient to provide acceptable doctoral training". Averages were then calculated for departments and departments then ranked. Cartter does not attempt to secure any averages for whole universities although he does for areas such as the social sciences and humanities. His reason is a good one since universities differ in the number of departments on which their rating is based. Thus the largest universities have as many as 29 departments (giving the Ph.D.) whereas places like M.I.T. and Cal-Tech. have a very small number of departments because of their special character. It is possible for those places, therefore, to attain a higher overall average simply because they do not offer work in as many areas. However, we desired an average measure. Since we were not going to identify any universities by names, and since we were only going to classify them into four prestige levels, we did not think that the danger was as serious as it would be if we had to talk about the particular universities and how they ranked. We therefore employed the Cartter procedure in addition to extra information we secured [illegible] directly from him for those universities whose ranks he does not report on. In addition we also worked out measures which took into account the number of departments at a university. Thus for example, we added a small weight according to the number of departments that a university offered Ph.D. work in. Two different weighting methods were used, one in which we added to the average score for each university the average for ~~a~~ the number of fields rated at all the universities and a second weighted score in which we added to a university's average score a simple weight consisting of the number of fields rated at that university. Through this procedure we obtained three scores, the Cartter score and two weighted scores. We then took the average of these three. We drew up distributions and then divided the distributions into four levels. A university had to fall into a given level on at least two of the measures. Most fell in the same level on the basis of all three. The levels were as follows:*

---

*Washington D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966

Prestige Levels #2 (Cartter corrected)

Prestige Level I

Berkeley, California
Chicago
Columbia
Harvard
Michigan
Minnesota
Princeton
Stanford
Wisconsin
Yale

Prestige Level II

U.C.L.A.-California
Cornell
Indiana
Johns Hopkins
Illinois
Northwestern
Ohio State
Pennsylvania
Texas
Washington

Prestige Level III

Cath. U. of America
Cincinnati
Colorado
Duke
Florida
Iowa State Univ.
Iowa
Kansas
Maryland
Michigan State
Missouri
New York U.
North Carolina
Penn State
Pittsburgh
Purdue
Rochester
Southern Cal.
Syracuse
Utah
Wash. University
Western Reserve

---

*These universities of course include some we did not study.

Prestige Level IV

Other Universities:

Alabama
Arkansas
Arizona
Aubura
Baylor
Boston
Connecticut
Denver
Emory
Florida State
Fordham
Georgia
Geo. Wash.
Georgetown
Kentucky
Louisiana State
Loyola U.
New Mexico
Nebraska
Notre Dame
Oklahoma
Oklahoma State U.
Oregon
Oregon State
Rutgers
St. Johns U.
St. Louis U.
State U. N.Y.
Temple
Tennesee
Tulane
Vanderbilt
Virginia
Washington State
Wayne State
Wyoming
Yeshiva

CHAPTER 3

THE GOALS OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

In this chapter we examine the total picture as revealed by a composite analysis of our goal data. The question to which we address ourselves is: Taken together, what do all of our respondents see as the goals of American universities? Taken together, what do they think those goals ought to be? Finally, to what extent is their congruence between these two broad treatments, again, taken together. That is do the goals which are important also turn out to be the goals which our respondents think ought to be important?

In order to increase the ease of readability of tables, we have listed below all of the goals that our questionnaire dealt with, numbering each one so that they are available for easy reference. Beside each we have provided a shorthand label which is the ~~lable~~ label which will be used throughout this report in any tabular presentations. We apologize for the brief, cryptic character of some of the labels. Their brevity was forced by the need to stay within limits required by the computer. ~~The card.~~

Table 2

Card & Column, Label, and Goal Classified by Type of Goal

A Student Expressive

Card & Column	Label		Goal
1/23	STUD INTELLECT	1.	Produce a student who, whatever else may be done to him, has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum.
2/17	WELL ROUND STUD	2.	Produce a well-rounded student, that is one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual and esthetic potentialities have all been cultivated.
1/41	AFFCT STUD PERM	3.	Make sure the student is permanently affected (in mind and spirit) by the great ideas of the great minds of history.
2/31	DVLP STUD OBJCT	4.	Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically.
1/25	STUD CHARACTER	5.	Develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices.
			B Student-Instrumental
2/33	STUD CAREERS	6.	Prepare students specifically for useful careers.
1/57	GV STUD SUC FAC	7.	Provide the student with skills, attitudes, contacts, and experiences which maximize the likelihood of his occupying a high status in life and a position of leadership in society.
1/43	TRAIN SCHARSHP	8.	Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor.
1/27	STUD TASTE	9.	Make a good consumer of the student - a person who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and can make good consumer choices.
2/27	STUD GOOD CITZN	10.	Produce a student who is able to perform his citizenship responsibilities effectively.
			C Direct Service
1/19	PROVD SPEC TRNG	11.	Provide special training for part-time adult students, through extension courses, special short courses, correspondence courses, etc.
2/19	ASSIST CITIZENS	12.	Assist citizens directly through extension programs, advice, consultation, and the provision of useful or needed facilities and services other than through teaching.
2/35	COMM CULT LDSHP	13.	Provide cultural leadership for the community through university-sponsored programs in the arts, public lectures by distinguished persons, athletic events, and other performances, displays or celebrations which present the best of culture, popular or not.

Card & Column	Label	Goal
1/29	DISSEMNT IDEAS	14. Serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas that will change the society, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts, or politics.
1/45	PRESRV HERITAGE	15. Serve as a center for the preservation of the cultural heritage.
		D Research
1/59	DO PURE RSEARCH	16. Carry on pure research.
2/37	APPLIED RESEARCH	17. Carry on applied research.
		E Adaptation Goals
2/39	ENSUR CONFIDNCE	18. Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially (other than students and recipients of services) to the finances and other material resource needs of the university.
2/21	MNTN FAV APPRSL	19. Ensure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs we offer (validating groups include accrediting bodies, professional societies, scholarly peers at other universities and respected persons in intellectual or artistic circles).
1/31	EDUC TO UTMOST	20. Educate to his utmost capacities every high school graduate who meets basic legal requirements for admission.
2/29	ACC GD STUD ONL	21. Accomodate only students of high potential in terms of the specific strengths and emphasis of the university.
1/47	SAT AREA NEEDS	22. Orient ourselves to the satisfaction of the special needs and problems of the immediate geographical region.
2/11	KEEP COSTS DOWN	23. Keep costs down as low as possible through more efficient utilization of time, and space, reduction of course duplication, etc.
1/11	HOLD OUR STAFF	24. Hold our staff in the face of inducements offered by other universities.
		F Management Goals
2/41	JUST REWD-PROF	25. Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, prerequisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to his own profession or discipline.
2/45	FAC UNIV GOVRN	26. Involve faculty in the government of the university.
1/49	STUD UNIV GOVRN	27. Involve students in the government of the university.
2/25	RUN UNIV DEMO	28. Make sure the university is run democratically insofar as that is feasible.

Card & Column	Label		Goal
1/33	KEEP HARMONY	29.	Keep harmony between departments or divisions of the university when such departments or divisions do not see eye to eye on important matters.
2/13	JUST REWD-INST	30.	Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, prerequisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to the functioning of this university.
1/13	WILL OF FACULTY	31.	Make sure that on all important issues (not only curriculum), the will of the the full-time shall prevail.
2/43	UNDERGRAD INSTR	32.	Emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program.
1/15	ENCOURG GRAD	33.	Encourage students to go into graduate work.
1/51	ENSUR UNIV GLS	34.	Make sure that the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible.
			G Motivation Goals
1/17	PROTCT ACD FRDM	35.	Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.
1/35	MAXIM OPPRTUNTY	36.	Make this a place in which faculty have maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a manner satisfactory to them by their own criteria.
2/47	PROV STUD ACTIV	37.	Provide a full round of student activities.
2/51	STUD RGT INQUIR	38.	Protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in.
2/15	STUD POL RIGHTS	39.	Protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind, and any attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals.
1/21	DEVLP FAC LYLTY	40.	Develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the university, rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns.
1/37	DEVLP PRIDE UNV	41.	Develop greater pride on the part of the faculty, staff and students in their university and the things it stands for.
			H Positional Goals
1/53	MAINTN QUALITY	42.	Maintain top quality in all programs we engage in.
2/53	MNTAIN QUALITY	43.	Maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards).
2/23	MNTN BAL QUALITY	44.	Maintain a balanced level of quality across the whole range of programs we engage in.
1/39	KEEP UP TO DATE	45.	Keep up to date and responsive.

Card & Column	Label		Goal
2/49	INCRS U PRESTGE	46.	Increase the prestige of the university or, if you believe it is already extremely high, ensure maintenance of that prestige.
1/55	PRESRV CHARACTER	47.	Keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphasis and point of view, its "character."

A. Goals: The Composite Picture

Tables ~~1~~ 3 and ~~2~~ 4 present the basic data on what our respondents perceive the goals to be and what they thought the goals ought to be. Each table follows the same general format. Column (1) presents the goal label. The next column presents the average score of the particular goal for the entire population of respondents. Our procedure was to calculate the mean at each university for a particular goal and then to calculate the mean of those means to obtain the score in the second column. This was done so that the different response rate at different universities as well as the different size of the different universities would not affect the importance of a particular goal. On the original questionnaire, as pointed out in the previous chapter, the respondent was able to rate each goal by checking one of the following choices:

	of absolutely top importance 5	of great importance 4	of medium importance 3	of little importance 2	of no importance 1
is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The respondent checked a box to indicate his view. The responses were scored as shown so that the higher the number the more important the person thought the goal is or should be. Thus, the goal at the top, academic freedom, is seen to have a mean of 3.90. This score was secured by taking averages at each university and then averaging them so that the overall average is 3.90, a position between of "medium importance" and "of great importance" but quite close to of great importance. At the other extreme "making a good consumer of the student" has a mean score of 2.47, that is between "of little importance" and "of medium importance" but slightly to the right of the midpoint between these two. In column (3), the standard deviations of the means are provided. This gives us a measure of the degree of dispersion of scores around the means and is, consequently, a measure of the amount of consensus that a particular goal is of the indicated degree of importance. The same interpretation is to be placed on the standard deviations in Table 3 following except that there, the standard deviation measures the degree of dispersion of the conceptions of respondents of what the goals of their universities should be. Column (4) contains the number of cases on which the scores are based. There are some variations due solely to the variation in response to this particular question. As is usual, some persons skip the question, others did not make clear how they wished to answer it either by checking more than one alternative or by writing in comments that cast doubt on the alternative that they did check.

Table 3

The Goals of American Universities

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Goal	Mean	Stand. Dev.	N
Protct Acd Frdm	3.90	0.83	7247
Incrs U Prestige	3.76	0.71	7201
Mntain Quality	3.69	0.73	6818
Ensur Confidnce	3.66	0.76	6935
Keep Up to Date	3.57	0.76	6953
Train Scholarshp	3.56	0.76	7207
Do Pure Research	3.55	0.83	7176
Maintn Quality	3.49	0.81	7155
Mntn Fav Apprsl	3.43	0.79	6782
Ensur Univ Goals	3.42	0.85	6761
Dissemnt Ideas	3.39	0.85	7154
Applied Research	3.39	0.80	7119
Stud Careers	3.39	0.72	7172
Stud Intellect	3.38	0.79	7112
Hold Our Staff	3.37	0.75	7096
Comm Cult Ldshp	3.33	0.73	7222
Stud Rgt Inquir	3.31	0.86	7007
Encourg Grad Wk	3.30	0.68	7042
Presrv Heritage	3.28	0.82	7023
Stud Good Citzn	3.27	0.76	7022
Well Round Stud	3.25	0.78	7127
Maxim Opportunty	3.22	0.78	7065
Dvlp Stud Objct	3.22	0.82	6957
Keep Costs Down	3.22	0.76	7103
Fac Univ Govrn	3.21	0.88	7154
Just Rewd Prof	3.20	0.75	6884
Prov Stud Activ	3.19	0.76	7110
Gv Stud Suc Fac	3.18	0.78	7014
Run Univ Demo	3.16	0.91	7058
Affct Stud Perm	3.16	0.80	6757
Assist Citizens	3.10	0.86	7116
Just Rewd Inst	3.10	0.74	6964
Devlp Pride Univ	3.09	0.77	7132
Sat Area Needs	3.07	0.90	7183
Mntn Bal Quality	3.07	0.82	6876
Will of Faculty	3.01	0.84	7032
Provd Spec Trng	3.00	0.90	7173
Stud Character	2.95	0.85	6940
Educ to Utmost	2.93	1.07	6900
Acc Gd Stud Onl	2.89	0.96	6962
Stud Pol Rights	2.88	0.86	6904
Devlp Fac Lylty	2.86	0.79	7126
Keep Harmony	2.84	0.79	6866
Undrgrad Instr	2.66	0.89	6692
Stud Univ Govrn	2.60	0.85	7080
Presrv Charactr	2.56	0.98	6895
Stud Taste	2.47	0.84	6821

Table 4

What University Administrators and Faculties Think The Goals of Their Universities Should Be

(1) Goal	(2) Mean	(3) Stand. Dev.	(4) N
Protct Acd Frdm	4.33	0.74	7247
Train Scholarship	4.17	0.62	7207
Stud Intellect	4.17	0.75	7112
Maintn Quality	4.14	0.72	7155
Dissemnt Ideas	4.10	0.77	7154
Keep up to Date	4.09	0.67	6953
Mntain Quality	3.99	0.72	6818
Dvlp Stud Objct	3.99	0.69	6957
Ensur Univ Gls	3.99	0.78	6761
Stud Rgt Inquir	3.88	0.82	7007
Incrs U Prestge	3.80	0.74	7201
Stud Character	3.79	0.89	6940
Just Rewd Inst	3.77	0.74	6964
Stud Good Citizn	3.76	0.77	7022
Affct Stud Perm	3.76	0.82	6757
Do Pure Research	3.76	0.80	7176
Well Round Stud	3.75	0.87	7127
Hold Our Staff	3.74	0.75	7096
Fac Univ Govrn	3.63	0.83	7154
Presrv Heritage	3.63	0.84	7023
Just Rewd-Prof	3.63	0.77	6884
Run Univ Demo	3.61	0.88	7058
Devlp Pride Univ	3.59	0.81	7132
Will of Faculty	3.56	0.83	7032
Maxim Opprtunty	3.55	0.85	7065
Ensur Confidnce	3.52	0.84	6935
Encourg Grad Wk	3.51	0.66	7042
Comm Cult Ldshp	3.49	0.76	7222
Devlp Fac Lylty	3.47	0.88	7126
Applied Research	3.37	0.85	7119
Mntn Bal Qualty	3.36	0.96	6876
Stud Careers	3.34	0.81	7172
Gv Stud Suc Fac	3.31	0.96	7014
Mntn Fav Apprsl	3.31	0.89	6782
Keep Costs Down	3.30	0.79	7103
Assist Citizens	3.22	0.89	7116
Educ to Utmost	3.19	1.26	6900
Provd Spec Trng	3.18	0.88	7173
Acc Gd Stud Onl	3.09	0.96	6962
Stud Pol Rights	3.08	0.97	6904
Keep Harmony	3.06	0.90	6866
Sat Area Needs	3.00	0.92	7183
Prov Stud Activ	2.99	0.85	7110
Undrgrad Instr	2.89	1.04	6692
Stud Taste	2.78	1.05	6821
Stud Univ Govrn	2.69	0.94	7080
Presrv Character	2.13	0.99	6895

First let us look at the amount of agreement that a given goal is where the average implies it is. In the first table, dealing with the way in which goals are seen, all but one of the standard deviations are below one (A general rule of thumb we employed for deciding whether there was sufficient agreement on the importance of a given goal to decide that confidence can be placed in the rating). Only one of the goals is over one and that is the goal "educate to his utmost capacities every high school graduate who meets basic legal requirements for admission." As can be seen that goal is not a very important one in any case (M = 2.93). But the size of the standard deviation suggests that although the average is low there appear to be a considerable number of persons spread out on either side of that average.

The goals that have standard deviations above 90 are the following: 1) Preserve present emphasis; 2) Only high potential students; 3) Extension training; 4) Needs of geographic region; 5) Run University democratically. As can be seen all of these goals are in the lower part of the distribution so far as importance is concerned. It is also interesting that none of them is an output goal, but involve aspects of what we have spoken of in the previous chapter as "support." It may be seen that among the more important goals there appears to be a much higher degree of consensus.

When we turn to the following table, which deals with a persons' conceptions of the way things ought to be rather than the way they in fact are, we see that there seems to be somewhat more dissensus, although again, not a great deal. There are three goals about which there is some measure of disagreement (standard deviation greater than one). All those greater than .90 are the following: 1) preserve present emphasis; 2) involve students in government; 3) needs of geographic regions; 4) keep harmony; 5) students right to direct action; 6) only high potential students; 7) educate all students; 8) student high status; 9) balance quality. Although the number is larger, still they are all goals whose averages are not high and again output goals are scarce among them, the only student output goal being "student high status."

The Top and Bottom Goals

What we did was to mark off at the top those goals whose means fall within one standard deviation approximately of the entire distribution from top to bottom. We did the same for those at the bottom. This resulted in seven goals falling in the top standard deviation and four goals falling in the bottom.

The top goals are seen to be:

1. protect the facult~~ies~~y's right to academic freedom
2. increase the prestige of the university
3. maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important
4. insure the continued confidence and support of those who contribute substantially to the finances and other material resource needs of the University
5. keep up to date and responsive
6. train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor
7. carry on pure research

At the other end, the bottom goals are seen to be:

1. make a good consumer of the student
2. keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now
3. involve students in the government of the University
4. emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program

What is most striking about the list of top goals is that practically all of them are what we have called support goals and all but one of them in no way involves students. Even that one refers to training students for research or other creative endeavors which is, after all, closely associated with what the professors consider to be important and represent a possible output to them, or to the academic field. This squares with the goal of carrying on pure research which is also rated very high. The singular scarcity of any emphasis on goals that have anything to do with students is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that of our total of 47 goals among which respondents could choose, 18 involved direct reference to students in some way. Thus there was ample opportunity, and a result so striking as this could hardly have been produced by chance or by a sampling bias.

Supporting this general finding is the fact that students are mentioned more frequently among the goals at the bottom. The goal at the very bottom involves undergraduate instruction. This is quite consistent then with the finding that pure research and preparing students for research creative careers are emphasized as top goals in American universities.

No particular pattern among the support goals is evident among the top goals although three of them are positional (increasing prestige of the University, maintaining top quality in programs felt to be important, and keeping up to date and responsive). As a general finding one can say that American universities, taken collectively emphasize only pure research as an output, but put it seventh to a variety of other goals which are more concerned with the position of their own university and the programs that it offers and with efforts to maintain a high quality at the university . At the very top they put academic freedom as a goal. Such a goal appears to be of first importance in American universities and refers to the importance in them of autonomy from outside interference of any kind. One must remember also that these findings do not refer to what people think ought to be the case, but rather to their perceptions of the way things are. The administrators and faculty at American universities believe that actually, right now, universities _do_ protect the faculties right to academic freedom more than they do any one of 46 other possibilities.

What Persons Feel The Top and Bottom Goals Ought To Be

We utilize the same procedure in selecting out a top and a bottom group--one standard deviation in the distribution of means of the top, and one standard deviation at the bottom. When we did so, we found the following to be those goals that persons felt ought to be at the top in the American university:

1. protect the faculty's right to academic freedom
2. train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research, and/or creative endeavor
3. produce a student who, whatever else may be done to him has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum

4. maintain top quality in all programs we engage in
5. serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas that would change the society, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts or politics
6. keep up to date and responsive
7. maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important
8. assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically
9. make sure the University is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the University in the most efficient manner possible.

On the other hand, those goals felt to belong at the very bottom are:

1. keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now
2. involve students in the government of the University
3. make a good consumer of the student

When we examine this distribution we see that although students come out a little bit better, the student goals are far from being prominent. As in ~~a~~ the case of how goals were perceived to actually be, persons felt that the faculty's right to academic freedom not only was the most important goal but that it ought to be the most important goal. This time however, two student goals came in second and third places, one refering to the same goal as had occured in the previous table, namely training students in research and related activities, but in addition persons felt that the goal dealing with cultivating the student's mind deserved a high amount of emphasis, (although it was not perceived as in fact given that emphasis). Here, then, we have a situation (to be discussed presently) in which respondents' conception of the way things ought to be is different from the way they actually are. In their view then more attention should be given to cultivating the student intellect than is in fact being given.

One other student goal also was present in this top group of nine, namely the goal dealing with assisting students to develop objectivity about themselves. Here again this goal which did not figure along with the goals actually being emphasized was apparently felt to be one which ought to be emphasized.

At the other end there was a feeling that involving students in the government of the University ought to be of very little importance. Apparently then in American universities those students seeking a greater share in decision making power at the University will not receive much support from administrators and faculty. On the other hand, students might take some consolation from the fact that there is no particularly strong feeling that the faculty should be involved in the government of the University either (M = 3.63). In general then students as a group are not felt to be particularly important when persons are asked about the goals of the University, nor is there any strong feeling that the situation in that respect is different than it ought to be (with one or two exceptions -- training a student in research and cultivating his intellect, and assisting him to develop objectivity about himself). There is no attention among top goals, either in what the goals are or what they should be, which suggest that it is an important goal of the University to prepare^student~~s~~ for^useful career~~s~~, to assist him in upward mobility, to assist him to be a good consumer or to become a good citizen.

Goal Congruence

In the case of seven goals, there is a congruence between the actual position and the position that persons feel they ought to be in. Four goals are perceived to be important and our respondents feel they ought to be important. These are:

1. protect the faculty's right to academic freedom
2. maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important
3. keep up to date and responsive
4. train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor.

The above four goals are perceived as of very high importance in American universities, and our respondents feel that that is the way they ought to be. The following three are at the bottom and our respondents feel that that is where they belong:

1. make a good consumer of the student
2. keep this place from coming something different from what it is now
3. involve students in the government of the University

On the whole the above is rather impressive evidence that, at least at the top and bottom, there is a fairly strong sentiment that things are the way they ought to be. We have four out of seven of the top nine goals and four out of none of the top "should be" goals that are congruent of one another. Practically all of the goals at the bottom are congruent ~~of~~ with one another.

This generally happy situation does not seem to prevail throughout the distribution. One way of examining the lack of general congruence is through what might be called the "sins of goal comission" and the "sins of goal omission". That is we can compare those goals which seem to be out of line with one another on the two scales. For example the goal "to develop loyalty ~~of~~ ON the part of faculty and staff to the University, rather than to their own jobs or professional concerns" is very low on the list of the way goals are perceived to actually be (being actually sixth from the bottom with a mean of 2.86). On the other hand when we look at the list of what persons think goals ought to be we find that this goal, while not at the top, is considerably higher up (being 19th up from the bottom and having a mean of 3.47). Here then is a goal which persons feel ought to be given more attention than it is in fact being given. We can conceive of this as a "sin of goal omission." Other goals which are not emphasized as much as our respondents think they ought to be are:

1. develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the University, rather than to their own jobs or professional concerns
2. make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, and perquisites always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to the functioning of the University
3. make sure the student is permanently affected by the great ideas of the great minds of history
4. assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence to examine those beliefs critically
5. produce a student who, whatever else is done to him, has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum

Looking over this list we see a relative dissatisfaction with goals which tend to be pushed to one side when the personal ambitions and the research careers of the faculty becomes dominant interests. In particular it is predict~~i~~Able that persons will feel that top faculty who are likely to be mobile, do not have sufficient loyalty to the University. In the second apparently neglected goal we see a feeling on the part of persons who serve on committees and attempt to do their jobs that they are not sufficiently well recognized. We also see the familiar plaint of the liberal arts person that not enough attention is being given to the student's mind or to the attempt to get the student to develop insight into himself.

When we turn to the "sins of goal comission", we are in a situation in which certain goals are emphasized very highly and our respondents feel that they are emphasized too much. The goals that are in this position are:

1. provide a full round of student activities
2. orient ourselves to the satisfaction of the special needs and problems of the immediate geographical region
3. keep costs down as low as possible through more efficient utilization of time, and space, reduction of cost duplication, etc.
4. insure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs we offer
5. prepare students specifically for useful careers
6. carry on applied research
7. encourage students to go into graduate work
8. insure the continued confidence and support of those who contribute substantially to the finances and other material resource needs of the University

We see that, although providing a full round of student activities is not emphasized as a goal (as we can see again by looking again at Table 3), nevertheless there is a feeling that it is emphasized more than it ought to be. Similarly respondents feel that there is too much attention being paid to serving the people in the local area or local community and too much pressure is being put upon them to keep the cost down, possibly to the detriment of what persons feel are more important goals. In addition persons resent the apparent emphasis on the need to satisfy outside organizations that validate programs. There is similar resistance to what might be construed as pressure from the outside in the emphasis on both preparing students for and carrying on applied research. In general most of the above would seem to be a resistance to what are sometimes thought of as traditional land-grant goals -- serving the local community and resistance to some of the imperatives of organization itself, such as keeping cost down and keeping those who pay the bills satisfied. On the whole these are entirely consistent with the emphasis that we have already noticed on academic freedom, and on the needs and the concerns of the faculty and their own professional careers. In addition we note again that the only way in which students come into the picture here is that, while there is a general feeling that not much attention is being paid to them or should be, that in one area at least, mainly providing a full round of student activities, the relatively little attention paid is too much. The same seems to be true for encouraging students to go into graduate work which is a more important goal, but the feeling is that it is more important than it ought to be.

CHAPTER 4

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GOALS AND GOAL VALUES

In the previous chapter an "is-should" comparison was made using the data based on all our respondents collectively. This has provided us with a crude conception of the relationship between these two ideas. We wish now to turn our attention to an even more fruitful analysis of these phenomena, namely, the "is-should" relationship expressed by respondents at each university represented in the study. We wish to know whether a goal, which is relatively high at American universities tends to be also one which is felt ought to be high and what is the size of this relationship, that is how strong is the tendency. More precisely, suppose a given goal, such as hold our staff in the face of other inducements, tends to be rated low at a particular university. Is there a tendency at that same university to feel that it should be rated low? Here then we are interested not simply in how goals are ranked across the board but how they are ranked at particular universities. This kind of analysis will shed light on the structure of universities through an analysis of their goals.

Two major kinds of comparison are offered in this chapter depending on (a) whether a goal is being compared with the way in which that same goal is rated at other universities or, (b) whether it is being compared with how other goals are rated at the same university. In the first case a given goal, such as hold our staff, may be rated low at a particular university in comparison to the way that same goal is rated at other universities. This kind of analysis we call "external analysis" and it is characterized by the letter X in the Tables that follow. ~~([illegible])~~ The other kind of analysis involves a comparison of a given goal with the way in which other goals are rated at that particular university.

For example the goal "hold staff" may be rated high in comparison to other universities, but at that particular university it may be rated as medium, in comparison to some other goals, such as "protect academic freedom", at that university. This is characterized in our analysis by the letter "W" for "within". In the analysis that follows the letter "I" stands for "is" and refers to how a goal is regarded at a particular university. On the other hand the letter "S" ("should be") refers to what the group at the university feels the importance of that goal should be. This "XI" refer to the external comparison of the way goals are in fact felt to be, whereas "SX" refer to the way, in an external comparison, the importance of goals are thought of as they should be. So too "WI" refers to a discussion of actual goals within a university whereas "WS" refers to a comparison to the way goals ought to be within the university. We provide four examples from our tables to illustrate the analysis.

TABLE 5

XS PROTCT ACD FRDM

		Low	Med.	High	Total
XI PROTCT ACD FRDM	Low	19	3	1	23
	Med.	4	13	5	22
	High	0	7	16	23
Tot	Total	23	23	22	68

Gamma = 0.883 Z = 7.943

TABLE 6

XS ENCOURG GRAD WK

		Low	Med.	High	**Total**
XI ENCOURG GRAD WK	Low	6	7	19	22
	Med.	7	11	5	23
	High	10	5	8	23
	Total	23	22	22	68

Gamma = -0.150 Z = -0.596

TABLE 7

WS MAXIM OPPORTUNTY

		High	Med.	Low	Total
WI MAXIM OPPORTUNTY	High	15	9	0	24
	Med.	3	24	4	31
	Low	0	5	8	13
	Total	18	38	12	68

Gamma = 0.906 Z = 8.217

TABLE 8

WS JUST RWD INST

WI JUST REWD INST		Med.	High	Total
	Low	10	19	29
	Med.	10	28	38
	High	0	1	1
	Total	20	48	68

Gamma = 0.224 Z = 0.618

Table 5 illustrates a relationship which turns out to be close. Here we examine the relationship between how important (relatively) academic freedom is perceived to be at a university and how important respondents think it should be. The procedure was to divide the distribution on these two variables into three parts called low, medium and high as illustrated in Table 5. In Table 5 the average score at all universities on the goal, "protecting academic freedom" has been ranged from the university with the lowest score on this particular goal (3.07) to the university which emphasizes this goal most (average 4.55). Similarly in the ~~right hand column~~ top row, the goal values, that is the extent to which it is felt a given goal ought to be emphasized, has been similarly arranged in distribution, from the university which feels that it is the least important with an average of 3.75 to the university whose average is 4.68 in the conception of people there of how important it ought to be.

Each of these distributions was trichotomized. If the average for a given university fell in the lowest third it was considered low, if in the middle, medium and if in the high third, high. The same thing was true of goal values. As is evident in the case of this particular goal it tends to be rated high everywhere and thus calling a university low does not mean it is necessarily low in importance at that university in comparison to other goals. But it is low in comparison to the extent to which this particular goal is emphasized at other universities. This is the meaning of the letter X (external) as indicated earlier. The next step is to examine for each university its position on each of these variables. Thus the goal, "protecting academic freedom", may be rated low at a particular university and the extent to which respondents of that university feel it ought to be important also has a score which is low. In such a university then the goal of "protecting academic freedom is not felt to be important in comparison to the importance assigned it at other universities, nor do people at that university feel it ought to be important (in comparison to the importance which faculty and administrators place on it at other universities). In a 3 x 3 table, we would put one score in the upper left cell of Table 5. On the other hand a particular university might be on in which the goal is rated as low in comparison to other universities but the persons at that university feel that it ought to be rated high and feel very strongly about this to the point where they assign it a score in the top third of the distribution. We would therefore score that university as low on the goal, but high on the goal value.

When this has been done for all 68 universities we arrive at the distribution shown in Table 5. As can be seen, there are 19 universities in which the goal of protecting academic freedom is not an important goal (relatively) and in which it is not felt that it ought to be an important goal (relatively). Similarly there are 16 universities in which academic freedom is rated high as a goal and in which persons feel that it ought to be high. It may be seen on inspection that most of the cases fall along the diagonal, indicating a strong relationship. There are few universities in which discrepancies occur; that is, in which the goal of protecting academic freedom is in fact of little importance, but where persons feel it ought to be, and the reverse. For example, there are no universities in which academic freedom is in fact important and in which persons feel that it should not be.

In order to measure the size of the relationship we have adopted throughout this report Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma.* This is a measure designed for ordinal variables of the type that we have, which has the advantage of being interpretable in a manner analogous to a percentage. Thus when we obtain a Gamma of .400 in one relationship and a Gamma of .800 in another it is possible to say that the relationship in the second case is twice as strong as in the first case. As persons familiar with Chi Square, or with relationship measures based on it are aware, this is not possible with those measures. The procedure employed by the Goodman and Kruskal measure is to take universities two at a time and to compare them on two variables. For instance, it is assumed that, if there is a positive relationship between the two variables, then if one university is higher than the other university on the one variable it ought to be higher on the other variable as well. The procedure is to count all pairs and to see the extent to which a university higher on one variable also tends to be higher on the other variables. If most such pairs turn out to fall into this category, then one obtains a high positive Gamma. The size of the Gamma measures the proportion of such pairs that fall in a positive direction. A negative Gamma implies just the reverse, ~~mainly~~ NAMELY that when a given university is higher than another university on some particular variable it tends to be lower than that university on a second variable, and this is true for a high proportion of such comparisons. Ties are not considered in the calculation. The measure then is a measure of a proportion of the pairs that fall in a given direction.

---

*See Goodman, L. A. and Kruskal, W. H., 1954. "Measures of Associations for Cross-Classifications." Journal of American Statistical Association, 49:732-764.

We have also calculated in every case a Z score and, in general, report only those findings in which the Z was 1.96 or higher, which implies that the probability of securing a Gamma as large or larger by chance would be less than 5 in 100. In most cases the Z scores that we obtained were very high indeed suggesting that the probability of a chance occurence is very low. As even the reader unfamiliar with statistics can see, a Table such as Table 5 shows a strong relationship, very few cases falling outside the diagonal.

In Table 6, we compare the goal of encouraging graduate work with the goal value of encouraging graduate work, for 68 universities. In this case however, as can be seen, the Z is considerably below 1.96 and the Gamma is also low. Since the Gamma turns out to be negative, one might infer that universities that encourage graduate work tend to be places in which the staff feel that graduate work should not be encouraged. However, since the Z is so low, this finding could certainly be due to chance.

Table 7 is an example of analysis in which the distribution of goals is internal rather than external (as in the two cases we have described). Here our procedure was to take all of the goals at a particular university and arrange them in order from high to low at that particular university. We then examined the goal that dealt with the extent to which people at the University feel faculty should be provided with maximum opportunity to pursue their careers, and observed whether that goal was rated in the top third, the middle third or the bottom third of the distribution of all goals at that particular university. For example, if it tended to be a goal that was rated high at that university, that is in the top third, then we called it "high" at that university. We did the same thing with how important people felt the goal ought to be. We arranged those goals and goal values at a particular university, into a distribution from low to high, and split the distribution into three parts. Then we looked at the goal value of maximum opportunity to pursue careers, and observed where it fell, whether in the upper, the middle or the lower distribution of that university. If it fell in the lower part, why then we called it "low". Thus for each university for each particular goal we have a rating low, medium or high at that particular university. Table 7 tells us that there were 15 universities in which the goal to provide a maximum opportunity for faculty to pursue their careers was an important one at that university, and in which there was also a very high rating of it in comparison to other goals at that university as a goal which ought to be highly valued. On the other hand there are 8 universities in which the goal was not felt to be important in comparison to other goals and in which it was not felt that it should be (in comparison to other goals). There are no universities in which the goal was rated as of little or no importance in comparison to other goals and in which it was rated as one that ought to be of little or no value in comparison to other goals. As can be seen when in Table 7 we obtain a strong relationship for this goal a Gamma of .906. This tells us that, at a given university, when the goal of providing maximum opportunity for faculty to pursue their careers is an important one in comparison to other goals, then there is a strong tendency for persons to feel that it ought to be highly valued in comparison to the way other goals are valued.

Table 8 deals with the extent to which a person's salaries and other perquisites reflect his contribution to the university. In this case it should be noticed that the category of "low" in the goal value (ws) column is absent altogether. This simply means that there were no universities in which that goal value was felt to be unimportant in comparison to other goals. There were however, 29 universities in which the goal was *in fact* not an important one, as can be seen from the marginal totals. In this table, the relationship is seen to be low and not significantly different from what chance would have produced.

TABLE 9

Across Institutions: Goals and Goal Values

Student Expressive	
develop stud object	(.731)
Student Instrumental	
stud taste	(.792)
stud careers	(.855)
Service	
prov spec training (extension)	(.789)
dissem. of ideas	(.569)
preserv heritage	(.664)
assist citizens	(.941)
Research	
do pure research	(.877)
applied research	(.744)
Adaptation	
due to utmost (high school grad's)	(.970)
sat area needs	(.898)
keep costs down	(.535)
maintain fav apprsl	(.530)
insure confid	(.562)
Management	
keep harmony	(.481)
stud univ gov't	(.679)
undergrad instruction	(.703)
fac univ gov't	(.466)
Motivation	
protct acad frdm	(.883)
maxim opportunty (fac careers)	(.773)
stud pol rts	(.738)
prov stud act	(.533)
stud rt inquir	(.744)
Positional	
maintain quality	(.562)
preserv character	(.810)

Having explained the way in which our data are presented, we turn now to the actual findings. We first consider the data relating goals to goal values, considered externally. That is, both goals and goal values are ranked in comparison to how they are ranked at all universities. The major findings are presented in Table 9.

In Table 9, it can be seen that, out of a total of 47 relationships that were examined, 25 turned out to have probabilities of occurence less than 5 in 100 by chance. Another way of putting this is that, if we adopt a significance level of 5 in 100, then we would expect (on the base of chance alone) 5 out of 100 examined relationships to be significant. This would mean that out of our group of 47, betwee 2 and 3 ought to be significant by chance. The actual number is between 8 and 12 times as frequent, as we can see. We can, therefore, dismiss the liklihood that this many findings could possibly occur by chance. Further the Gamma values are all very high, the lowest being above .500 and some of them ranging into the nineties. In general then, one might infer that where a goal is more important at a university than it is at two thirds or more of all other universities, then persons will express the feeling that it should be more important than do persons at two thirds or more of all other universities. What we seem to have is a type of stratification of universities in which a third emphasizes 25 of the 47 goals. That third is found to be the same third that emphasizes the corresponding goal values. At the other end, a bottom third considers these goals of low significance and that same third also rates the goal values* of low significance. This is not to say they are of high, or low significance in comparison to other goals at the university. (That is the meanin of our W or Within analysis--to be considered in the next section). The comparison is with the way the same goal is rated at other universities. So a university may rate a goal low in comparison to other universities, but high in comparison to other goals at the same university.

The finding that 25 of the 47 are significant may suggest that universities are selective in mission and in the kinds of persons they attract. Universities high in a goal tend to be high in the corresponding goal value. They are among the top in emphasizing, for example, protecting academic freedom. They will also be among the top in those that think academic freedom should be protected. This suggests that

---

*It will be recalled that the term "goal value" refers to the responses of persons to goal questions in which they indicated not what they perceived the goal to be, but rather how important they thought it should be.

that is part of their mission or image: it should be important and they see to it that it is. Perhaps they also attract people for that reason and perhaps repel others who are not concerned about it, or consider it irrelevant.

A second finding is that, of the 25 significant goals with high Gammas, 16 are support goals. Furthermore, the support goals that are significant make up quite a high proportion of all support goals asked about. A possible interpretation is that support goals are often more visible or easier to talk about, when comparing universities, than are output goals. For example, professors get together and describe such opportunities as time off for research, sabbatical programs, promotional policies, fringe benefits, and other such support matters. It is much harder to make comparisons on teaching, service, or even research. Actually, each is likely to make exaggerated claims on those goals, in any case. We can say that persons find that they can carry on or live with a situation in which output goals are emphasized more than at other universities, but people may not feel they should be; than they can at a place where such discrepancy exists among support goals. Support goals seem to be an efficient medium of communication. The finding underlines the fact that universities are not only organizations with output goals, but also places in which persons carve out careers, as we suggested in our discussion in Chapter 1.

Among the output goals themselves, the goals that do show up as important do not involve students, but involve direct service to the community in some way, or research. This is quite consistent with our earlier findings that universities tend not to place goals that involve students very high in importance, nor do they feel that they ought to be important. The fact that the relationships for most of the student goals are low, suggests that our respondents find no necessary inconsistency in being in a place in which a student goal may be felt to actually be important, but in which they feel it should not be important, or the reverse. It simply does not bother them, at least does not bother them to the extent that they leave or decide to do something about it. If that were the case, we would have found a relationship between these things.

Adaptation goals loom very large among the significant relationships. As a matter of fact of the seven possible adaptation goals, five turn out to be significant and all of them have good strong Gammas. Clearly it is important for subjects to be in places in which the adaptation goals are as they think they ought to be in comparison to other universities. The same thing is true of the motivation goals. As can be seen most of them have high Gammas. This perhaps is more predictable since persons will tend to stay at places in which they feel highly motivated, and to leave if there is inconsistency in this area.

On the other hand in the case of the management goals only four out of ten possibilities are found to be significant -- those involving keeping harmony, giving students a voice in university government, emphasizing undergraduate instruction, and involving faculty in the government of the university. Rather interesting is the fact that the management goal of rewarding people according to their contribution is not felt to involve a necessary relationship between the way it is and the way it ought to be. This is true whether the contribution is to the person's own discipline, to the university or whether the university is felt to be run by people who could run it most efficiently. Apparently persons find it quite possible to be in universities in which some persons are rewarded according to their contributions to the university and yet there is some feeling that should not be the case. The same thing is true of other contributions. The university would seem then to have a place for both. Both types of orientations can subsist even though persons feel that things are not the way they ought to be.

Similarly, positional goals produce only two significant relationships: that involving top quality in all programs and preserving the character of the university. This latter suggests that persons will not long stay in a place in which there is any profound disagreement about the degree of emphasis on maintaining character and the way it is felt that ought to be. If a person is in a place which does emphasize such preservation and he feels it should not, he tends to move on, and vice versa. Change, (or the lack of it, when persons feel it's desirable) is apparently disturbing to university personnel. It is rather interesting too that increasing the prestige of the university does not produce a significant relationship. Apparently it is possible for persons to continue to work in a place in which a good deal of effort has been spent in increasing the prestige of the university, but persons feel that little ought to be, or in which relatively little effort is being expended and persons think something ought to be done about it. Perhaps in this latter case persons feel an attachment to the university and express this by wishing that something more were done to increase its prestige. This might make it even more attractive than it is to them.

Within Institutions: Goal and Goal Values

We proceed next to the type of analysis illustrated in Tables 7 and 8. Here we compare the way in which a given university ranks a particular goal in comparison to the way that it ranks other goals at that particular university, rather than in comparison to other universities, as in the previous analysis.*

We obtain the results as shown in Table 10. Out of 47 comparisons, 20 turn out to be significant. Like our comparison of goals across universities, this number is far beyond what chance would have produced. The gammas are, again, very high. A fair inference is: where a goal is important in comparison to other goals at a university, it is also felt that it should be more important than other goals.

---

*"Within" and "Across" comparisons of goals have rather different theoretical significance. A given goal, for example, academic freedom, was practically always ranked in the upper third of goals at any particular university. Hence, if our analysis had been limited strictly to "within" comparisons, that goal would be a constant and could not have been related to any other variables. On the other hand, when we compare universities with one another, although academic freedom may be among the top goals at a particular university, it may be quite low in comparison to how that goal is rated at other universities. Administrators would be primarily interested in the "within" comparisons, of course.

One might interpret this finding to imply a tendency for persons to be unhappy at places in which goals are not what they think they ought to be. Such persons either leave that place, so that those that remain are happy with the goals as they are, or else they modify the goals until they are in accord with their feelings of what the goals ought to be. Still another interpretation might be that persons modify their feelings in accord with the goals; that is, they adjust to them. There is a remarkable congruence, in any case.

Table 10

Within Institutions: Goals and Goal Values

Student Expressive	
Affect Stud Perm	(.668)
Well Round Stud	(.588)
Stud Intellect	(1.000)*
Student Instrumental	
Gv Stud S Fac (mobility)	(.825)
Stud Careers	(.941)
Service	
Provide Spec Training (Extension)	(.732)
Dissem Ideas	(.898)
Preserve Heritage	(.672)
Assist Citizens	(.968)
Comm. Cult. Ldshp.	(.676)
Research	
Do pure research	(.940)
Adaptation	
Hold our staff	(.855)
Educate to utmost	(.743)
Management	
Encourage Grad Wk	(.805)
Fac Univ Gov't	(.756)
Will of Faculty	(1.000)
Motivation	
Maxim opportunity(Fac Careers)	(.906)
Stud Pol Rights	(.857)
Stud Rgt Inquir	(.754)
Position	
Mntn Bal Quality	(.831)

*Both goal and goal value always fall in top third at almost all universities.

We notice that student output goals are somewhat more prominent in producing significant relationships than was the case with the across institution comparison. However, there is not a large difference. Considerably more striking is the more prominent role that output goals in general play in the total distribution. They are found to make up more than half of all the significant relationships. This does not appear to be due to the considerably larger number of output goals as such, but rather to the considerably smaller number of support goals in comparison to the across institution analysis. Here we can speak of the kind of universities that people find it comfortable to be in. We can say that since we are comparing goals at a given university with other goals at that same university that, for example, the finding for the goal of producing a well rounded student (Gamma .588) suggests that persons find that if that goal is important, they tend to feel that it should be; if it is not important in comparison to other emphases of that university, they feel it should not be. This is a situation of internal congruence.

In general then, our findings in this analysis suggests that persons find it more important to be in settings in which there is congruence between output goals and the way they think output goals ought to be, than in places in which there is congruence between support goals and the way support goals ought to be. On the whole, this is perhaps what one would expect since the output refers to the way in which the university is judged as an organization by students and clients and it certainly is the activity that the professors are most directly involved in. This would imply that persons find it essential to be in a place which is doing what ought to be done. They apparently are able to put up with situations in which they are not receiving the support that they think they ought to be receiving.

However, one notices particular support goals for which this assertion is not true. In particular persons feel that when "hold our staff" is emphasized, it ought to be; and that when they are in places where all students are served ("educate to utmost"), ~~and~~ then that is the kind of emphasis there ought to be. So to with certain management goals ("encourage graduate work") and giving the faculty a voice in university government as well as, that the will of the faculty ought to prevail. Respondents also seem to desire congruence in providing opportunity to pursue their careers and in providing for student political rights and their right to inquire. The rather poor showing of adaptation goals suggests a certain tolerance among faculty and administrators when there is incongruence among those goals. Persons apparently find it possible to live with a situation in which the university spends a good deal of its time satisfying the local geographic region and in which they feel the university should not, as an example.

CHAPTER 5

GOALS RELATED TO GLOBAL MEASURES

In our attempt to describe the structure of universities, great emphasis was placed on the goals of the universities. In this chapter we examine the question of whether universities differ by the type and kinds of goals they emphasize or downgrade. The ways that we have of characterizing a university as a whole we have called "global" measures, since unlike the type of averages that we have operated with previously, these are characteristic of the university as a whole. For example, we decided that a given goal was felt by the people at a particular university to be one that ought to be pursued by taking the rating of each respondent at that university on that particular measure. We would add up each persons rating AND divide by the number of raters to obtain an average. We would then use this average to characterize the university as a whole. Here, on the other hand, to compute "global" measures, we use such indicators as whether the university is private or state, its prestige, and other such measures which are not derived by averages from ratings of individuals in it, but by taking as our measure something which characterizes the whole. In general, with certain exceptions to be described, our measures were secured from American Universities and Colleges (8th Ed.).

The global measures we used were as follows:

1. type control
2. size (as measured by the size of the staff and the number of students)
3. productivity (as measured by number of doctorates in 1962-63 and amount of contract research)
4. quality (as measured by prestige and a count of the number of volumes in the library)
5. degree of emphasis on graduate work and research (as measured by the proportion that graduate students make up of the total student body.
6. location (region in the country and whether the university was located in a metropolitan area or not).

Type of Control and Goals

When we compare private and state universities we encounter a large number of definite differences in the goals of the university. The differences are indicated in Table 11

Table 11

Goals Related to Global Measures

Type of Control

	Private		State	
Student Expressive	Stud. Intellect	(.788)		
	Affct. Stud. Perm.	(.784)		
	Devlp. Stud. Objct.	(.741)		
Student Instrumental	Train Scholarship	(.599)	Stud. Careers	(.603)
Direct Service	Dissem. Ideas	(.531)	Assist Citizens	(.837)
Research			Applied Res.	(.552)
Adaptation	Acc Grad. Stud. Only	(.874)	Educ. to Utmost	(.941)
	Ensur Confidence	(.548)	Sat. Area Needs	(.718)
			Keep Costs Down	(.626)
Management	Encourage Grad Wk.	(.602)	Keep Harmony	(.688)
			Stud. Univ. Govt	(.801)
			Undergrad. Instruc	(.599)
Motivation	Protct Acad. Frdm.	(.627)	Prov. Stud. Activ.	(.602)
	Maxim Opportunty	(.535)		
	Stud. Rt. Inquir.	(.566)		
Position	Keep up to date	(.552)		
	Preserv. Character	(.573)		
	Incrs. U. Prestige	(.647)		

We note first that there are 27 significant relationships out of the possible 47, a result certainly very different from what chance would lead one to expect. When we look at the findings themselves we find a real difference in the degree of emphasis on student expressive goals. Of the 5 possibilities 3 are found in private schools. Private schools emphasize much more than state schools the goal of producing a student who has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum, making sure the student is permanently affected by the great ideas of the great minds of history, and assisting students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs. In fact no student expressive goals at all are emphasized more in state universities than they are in private universities. There are no large differences in the other output goals and those that exist are predictable. Thus we see that private universities emphasize training students in scholarship and research more than ~~to~~ do the state universities whereas the state universities emphasize preparing students for useful careers more. In the case of direct service, the private universities see themselves as a center for the dissemination of new ideas to a greater extent than do state schools, with the state schools in turn seeing themselves as more directly involved in the extension goal of assisting citizens to solve their problems through extension programs, advice and consultation. For the research goals, the emphasis on pure research apparently* is no different in the private or state universities, there being as great an emphasis on this subject in one as in the other, but state universities take on the additional goal of doing applied research to a significantly greater extent than do private universities.

---

*Actually, there was a Gamma of .419, showing greater emphasis on pure research in private universities. However, the relationship did not reach the 5% level of significance, though it came close.

When we look at the support goals, we encounter a large number of definite differences. Apparently the support structure in private universities is definitely of a different character than it is in public universities. As we look down the column under private universities, we see that private universities emphasize much more being picky about the students that they get and being concerned with the continued confidence and support of financial contributors, the latter undoubtedly a reflection of the greater dependence of private universities on special sources of funds other than the legislature. On the other hand state universities to a very great extent (Gamma = .941) emphasize accepting all students who can legally enter, satisfying the local geographic region and keeping costs down. The last very likely reflects the close look of legislative committees.

As we look further we see that private universities emphasize encouraging students to go on into graduate school considerably more than do the state schools. The state schools instead, worry more about keeping harmony, involving students in university government, and emphasizing undergraduate instruction even at the expense of graduate instruction. The latter is a clear difference with the emphasis on encouraging students to go on to graduate work in private universities. Apparently the private university sees itself as far more a graduate affair than does the state university.

In the case of motivation, private schools are more concerned with protecting academic freedom than are state schools, a rather surprising finding since we found that this was an important variable throughout the system. This means that although it is important everywhere it is particularly important in the private schools. It is important to remember we are not telling about what people think ought to be the case, but what they believe in fact is the case. Apparently those in private schools feel that academic freedom is more important than do people in state universities.

So too in private universities there is more concern with providing maximum opportunity for the faculty to pursue their own careers and for the students right to inquire. On the other hand in state universities student activities are felt to be an important goal. Lastly, no state universities emphasize the position goals at all. On the other hand, it's in private universities that we see a concern with keeping up to date, preserving their distinctive character, and increasing their prestige. The latter is perhaps related to the elitist way in which private universities might be expected to see themselves. The emphasis on preserving the unique character of the university might too be a reflection of historical or traditional matters. SINCE ~~The~~ the state university is much more caught up in the push and pull of every day affairs and satisfying the local geographic region, perhaps they can pay less attention to these matters.

Certain goals are equally important in either private or state universities and some of them are interesting. For example, the goal of providing the student with skills, etc. so that he can move up in the society apparently is equally important in both private and state universities. They may address themselves ~~at~~ to different student bodies but those students who seek upward mobility apparently can get it in either place. So too there seems no difference in the extent to which private or state universities emphasize holding their staff in the face of inducements to leave. Apparently they are equally concerned with the loss of good staff (one might guess to one another). Involving the faculty in government and running the university democratically are apparently of equal importance (or of no importance) at both kinds of universities and developing faculty loyalty to the university, or greater pride on the part of the faculty and students in their university is no different in emphasis in the two kinds of places.

Goals and Type of Control: Within Universities

The previous section dealt with differences in goal emphasis between private and state universities when the position of each university on a particular goal is compared with other universities. Thus it was found that the goal of protecting academic freedom was more important in the private universities that it was in the state universities. A more precise statement of that relationship is that when universities are ranged in order of the emphasis which they give to academic freedom, private universities are much more likely to be found among the top third of the universities than they are elsewhere. In turn, state universities are more likely to be found further down on the list in their degree on emphasis.

Here our attention turns to the internal structure of the university. Here we are not interested in how a university ranks the goal of academic freedom in comparison to other universities but how it ranks that goal in comparison to other goals at that particular university. It is entirely possible that a university may do very well in comparison to other universities but on its home ground, may give other goals even greater emphasis. We find for example that, within universities the goal of academic freedom is not placed ahead of other goals at a particular university any differently in private from state universities. Thus, although private universities as a group emphasize this goal more than state universities, within the universities themselves it receives no different emphasis on the two kinds of universities. As a matter of fact it turns out to be very high in emphasis compared to other goals at each of these kinds of universities, but not differentially so in favor of one or the other.

Table 12

Goals and Type Control

Within Universities

Private			State	
		Student Expressive		
Stud Intellect	(.862)			
Affct Stud Perm	(.848)			
Dvlp Stud Objct	(.931)			
		Student Instrumental		
Gv Stud Suc Fac	(.563)		Stud Careers	(.673)
			Comm Cult Ldshp	(.569)
		Direct Service		
Dissemnt Ideas	(.535)		Assist Citizens	(.767)
		Research		
			Applied Research	(.705)
		Adaptation		
Acc Gd Stud Onl	(.888)		Hold Our Staff	(.593)
			Mntn Fav Apprsl	(.680)
			Educ. to Utmost	(.844)
			Sat Area Needs	(.533)
			Keep Costs Down	(.562)
		Management		
		Motivation		
Maxim Opportunty	(.604)		Prov Stud Activ	(.638)
		Position		

We see that 14 of the relationships turn out to be significant and to have high Gammas, a finding certainly far above what change would have produced.*

When we look at the distribution of findings in the Table we find that, as in the case of the comparison across universities made previously, student expressive goals are likely to be much more important at private universities than they are at state universities. In this particular case private universities are likely to emphasize (in their top third) developing the student's intellect, affecting him permanently, and developing objectivity about himself. With reference to the other student expressive goals there are no differences between state and private universities. For student instrumental goals a rather surprising finding is the greater emphasis which the private universities are found to give to giving the students skills and so forth to facilitate upward mobility, in comparison to the state universities. Certainly many people think of the state university (and not the private university) as a place in which the children of the poor go to secure an education which will enable them to rise. It may well be that in the private universities, upward mobility goals are also important in comparison to other goals, with persons thinking of the university as a place to secure polish for the upward mobility which is almost certain to take place for this group.

---

*Three other of the goals obtained Gammas of 1.000 but this consequence is an artifact which is produced by overwhelming marginals on one of the variables. In particular the goal of academic freedom was rated among the top third of the goals at each university at 41 out of the 42 state universities and at 26 of all 26 of the private universities. On the other hand the goal of keeping harmony was rated in the lower third of goals at each university at 41 of the 42 state universities and all 26 of the private universities. The goal of giving students a voice in university government was rated among the lower third of goals at each of 39 of the 42 state universities and all 26 of the private universities. What these findings mean is that there are no differences in the two kinds of universities on these variables, academic freedom being high everywhere compared to other goals and keeping harmony and giving the students a voice in the government being low practically everywhere.

The adaptation goals are striking in their differences. As in the case of the previous analysis we see a clear difference between the conception of the two kinds of universities of their mission with reference to selectivity of students. Private universities place in the top third of their goals the need to serve only the best students. In contrast, state universities see an obligation to try to educate to the utmost all who qualify for admission. As we would have predicted, they are much more concerned with the hard-core problems of satisfying the local area needs, keeping costs down, and maintaining the favorable appraisals of validating groups.

A rather striking difference between this analysis and the analysis across universities is the relatively small number of goals in the management, motivation and positional area. In fact it is only the adaptation goals that show up at all among the support goals. A conclusion from this finding might be that although universities, when compared with each other, produce the general result that the state universities are more bothered by support problems and concerned about them than private universities, within particular universities, this is not the case. On the contrary, it seems that in very few universities are support problems ranked above output goals within the university. The personnel of universities are saying in effect: "It may well be that in comparison to private universities, we give more attention to support goals than they do. On the other hand within the university here we see to it that that does not get in the way of our giving attention where attentio belongs and that is on the output goals. The support goals do not take first place over them."

Size and Goals

The findings with reference to size whether measured by size of staff or size of students (and these are not the same) were disappointing, and contrary to the conceptions of many people that the goals of universities shift as the size of the university does. We found only that as the number of full time staff increases, then there is a tendency for universities to emphasize more the dissemination of ideas, keeping up to date and doing pure research. As the number of full time students increase the only goal that became important was community cultural leadership. In effect what we are saying is that as the university gets larger there is no relationship that our data show to its goals. Apparently large universities have about the same goals or emphasize the same goals as the smaller ones.

It is entirely possible here that there may be a difference by size which we have not detected, but which only comes into existance when a place reaches university status. From then on whatever size the university reaches appears to be irrelevant. This may be true, but our small universities were small by any ordinary standards.

Productivity

Productivity includes two measures, namely the number of doctorates awarded at a university in the year 1962-63, and the amount of contract research which the university does. Although both of these reflect a variety of influences, they may also be felt to reflect the kind of productivity that the university exhibits with reference to the goals associated with graduate work and research, which are central goals in universities generally as opposed to state colleges, liberal arts colleges, and other kinds of institutions.

Our data on the number of doctorates and goals are presented in the two following tables.

Table 13

Goals and Number of Doctorates (1962-63) Across Universities

Student-Expressive	
Affct Stud Perm	(.473)
Devlp Stud Objct	(.479)
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholrshp	(.690)
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	(.608)
Presrv Heritage	(.478)
Research	
Do Pure Research	(.685)
Adaptation	
Encourg Grad Wk	(.641)
Mntn Fav Apprsl	(.519)
Management	
Just Rewd--Prof	(.602)
Undrgrad Instr	(.575)
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunity	(.456)
Position	
Keep Up to Date	(.719)
Maintn Quality	(.528)
Incrs U prestg	(.446)
Mntain Quality	(.630)

Table 14

Goals and Number of Doctorates (1962-63) Within Universities

Student-Expressive	
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholrshp	(.810)
Stud Good Citzn	(-.651)
Stud Careers	(-.577)
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	(.684)
Research	
Do Pure Research	(.686)
Adaptation	
Sat Area Needs	(-.525)
Mntn Fav Apprsl	(-.865)
Acc Gd Stud Only	(.510)
Management	
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	(.458)
Position	

The results give the investigators some confidence in the validity of their work, for the relationships under this heading "make sense". That is, a number of them are what one would have predicted ought to be associated with doctorate production. In particular when one looks at the comparison across universities, it makes sense that the greater the emphasis ~~of~~ in the university on doctorate production, the more would it emphasize the goal of training in scholarly and research activities, doing pure research, encouraging graduate work, making sure that a professor is rewarded in accordance with his contribution to his own field, that maximum opportunity is provided for him to develop in his own career, and that the university should make every effort to keep up to date, maintain quality and increase or maintain its prestige.

When we examine the findings within universities, some differences emerge. Those universities which emphasize doctorate production are also likely to be those universities which, compared to each other, also emphasize student expressive goals in the form of making sure the student is affected permanently by the great ideas of history and assisting the student to develop objectivity about himself. On the other hand whether a university is a high producer of doctorates or not does not affect the degree of emphasis on such goals within the university in comparison to other goals. But it does affect the student instrumental goals. We see that those universities which are heavy producers of doctorates are also likely to deemphasize the citizenship goals and preparing students for useful careers in comparison to other goals.

Doing pure research is strongly correlated with doctorate production, both when one compares the university to other universities and when compares this goal to other goals. This means that among those universities that are high doctorates producers, pure research will be emphasized above other goals at that same university.

With adaptation goals we find some differences, with universities that are high producers of doctorates tending to deemphasize satisfying the areas needs in comparison to the other goals and with emphasizing being selective about students to a greater extent than it emphasizes other goals. We do not find motivation goals presented in any great number when doctorate production goes up suggesting that motivation goals are about the same whatever the doctorate production of the institution. We notice too that position goals only show up in the across university comparison. This may be taken to mean that only when compared to other universities does doctorate production lead a university to worry about its position. Within the university presumably its position is not a subject of concern, at least when one compares one goal to another. Caplow's concept of the self-aggrandizement effect, as it has been described for organizations, seems evident. Within organizations persons tend to think of themselves very highly and not to worry about comparison with other organizations.

Goals and Contract Research

Another measure of productivity of the university that we employed was the volume of contract research carried on by the university. Again universities are classified in three categories; high, medium and low in this measure. The results are presented in Tables 15 and 16.

Table 15

Goals and Contract Research Across Universities

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.587
Affct Stud Perm	0.508
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.573
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.606
Train Scholrshp	-0.694
Stud Careers	-0.479
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.695
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.773
Adaptation	
Sat Area Needs	-0.556
Acc Grad Stud Only	0.634
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.687
Keep Harmony	-0.496
Stud Univ Govrn	-0.499
Just Rewd Prof	0.632
Undrgrad Instr	-0.680
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.466
Maxim Opportunty	0.561
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.503
Position	
Keep Up to Date	0.802
Maintn Quality	0.706
Incrs U Prestg	0.604
Mntain Quality	0.643

Table 16

Goals and Contract Research:
Within Universities

Student-Expressive	
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholrshp	0.718
Stud Good Citizen	-0.533
Stud Careers	-0.510
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.752
Assist Citizens	-0.521
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.699
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.476
Sat Area Needs	-0.552
Keep Costs Down	-0.476
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.754
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.639
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.575
Just Rewd Prof	0.531
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.621
Provd Stud	-0.554
Position	
Maintn Quality	0.833

When universities are compared to one another, we see that those universities that fall in the top third in the amount of contract research that they have --- the giants in this area -- emphasize certain student expressive goals while de-emphasizing others. The student that goes to such a place is likely to find that the importance of developing the students intellect, of affecting him permanently with the great ideas of the great minds of history, and of developing some degree of insight into himself are all emphasized to a much greater extent than they are in universities that have less contract research. On the other hand he will find very little attention being given to the question of making a good consumer of the student or preparing for a useful career. As would be predicted the goal of training persons in scholarship or research is important. He will also find such a university seeing its mission as that of disseminating new ideas to the surrounding area and, of course, of doing pure research.

When we come to support goals we find a number of relationships which mark off this kind of university from others. As may be seen it is not concerned at all with satisfying area needs, in fact, the greater amount of contract research the less important is this felt to be an important goal. On the other hand such a university is more selective in its recruitment policy for students. It is positively not concerned with keeping harmony, with giving the student a place in the running of the university, or with emphasizing undergraduate instruction. In fact the negative value for undergraduate instruction would suggest that students should beware of this kind of institution if they are looking for good solid undergraduate teaching. To confirm that judgment we see that the goal of encouraging graduate work is positively emphasized. These appear to be good universities for professors to work in since academic freedom is emphasized to a greater extent than elsewhere, as well as providing maximum opportunities for professors. These universities see it essential that they keep up to date, maintain quality in all things as well as keeping other things up to standard when asked about that subject. They are much concerned with the prestige of the institution, more so than other universities. They also encourage student inquiry.

When we turn to the analysis within universities as presented in Table 16, we are struck by two differences in the structure of these universities: the absence of any student expressive goals and the large number of negative relationships. The lack of student expressive goals may be taken to mean that although universities which have alot of contract research in comparison to other universities are places in which student expressive goals comparatively are emphasized, within such universities they are not emphasized to a greater extent than other goals; in fact, one finds they are emphasized no more or no less than other goals are. Certain goals are held in high esteem at the university, but they are those that serve as little more than validation of our confidence that we are in fact getting at our subject here. High in the list of goals at such universities is the goal of training people in research, disseminating new ideas, doing pure research, and encouraging graduate work.

The large number of negative relationships may be taken to mean that, although it is difficult to characterize these universities as necessarily giving a special place to certain goals above other goals it is possible to characterize them as places which are very careful to see to it that certain goals do not become more important than others. These goals are those that involve worrying about citizenship, preparing students for useful careers, helping people in the surrounding area, doing one's best with any and all students that qualify, satisfying the local area's needs, worrying about costs, worrying about the appraisal of validating groups, and providing a round of student activities. We cannot conclude, of course, that these activities do not go on since they do at all universities, but when a university has a great volume of contract research, it sees to it that these do not become the tail that wags the dog. They are kept rigidly under control and kept at a low level of importance in such universities.* As in the case of the comparison across universities, the goal of maintaining top quality in all ~~progress~~ programs is highly correlated, with a Gamma of .833, with volume of contract research. This is another way of saying that in those universities that do an enormous amount of contract research, the goal of maintaining top quality is among the top third of its goals. There is no question that some contract research is bread-and-butter service. But we have strong evidence here that most of it is associated with pure research and is associated with a powerful feeling at the university that it should maintain top quality in all things. With such contract research it has the money to do it, at least in a large number of areas.

University Quality and Goals

University quality was approached by reference to two measures. One was a measure of prestige which was based on ratings provided in a study carried out by the American Council on Education,** as described in Chapter 2 above. We also made use of a cruder measure (because the data were available); namely number of volumes in the library. Although it might be felt that this measure would be simply another way of estimating size of university, Cartter presents data which suggests that such is by no means the case. On the contrary, volumes in the library correlate very highly with the quality of universities. Cartter reports a correlation coefficient of .794 between quality as measured by his rating and index of library resources.***

---

*Two goals, "keep harmony" and "ensure a student role in the government of the university", were associated, with Gammas of -1. This result occurs because in both cases, in 67 out of the 68 universities, these goals were rated as low in comparison to other goals. In other words they are never in the top two-thirds in the distribution of goals at any of these 68 universities and consequently are not emphasized at any universities including those which have a great deal of contract research.

**(Cartter, An Assessment of Quality In Graduate Education) Wash. D.C., American Council on Education, 1966

***(pages 114-115).

Prestige and University Goals

A very high proportion of our goals were found to be significantly related to prestige. It is one of the most distinctive characteristics of a university and may well be the one thing that marks it off from all other kinds of organizations. By this we mean that universities are judged, not necessarily in terms of any products that come out of it, nor in terms of some job that it does, but rather in terms of how it is seen by others. The prestige measure that we used is an excellent measure of that phenomenon, whatever relationship it may have to "quality". The findings are presented in Tables 17 and 18.

Table 17

Prestige and University Goals:
Across Universities

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.516
Affct Stud Perm	0.473
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.703
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.553
Train Scholarship	0.730
Stud Careers	-0.504
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.799
Presrv Heritage	0.651
Assist Citizens	-0.455
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.891
Adaptation	
Sat Area Needs	-0.628
Keep Costs Down	-0.448
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.583
Acc Gd Stud Only	0.556
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.709
Just Rewd Prof	0.772
Undrgrad Instr	-0.697
Motivation	
Prtct Acd Frdm	0.496
Maxim Opportunity	0.657
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.517
Position	
Keep Up to Date	0.818
Maintain Quality	0.705
Incrs U Prestg	0.691
Mntain Quality	0.756

Table 18

Prestige and University Goals:
Within Universities

Student-Expressive	
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholrshp	0.740
Stud Good Citizen	-0.541
Stud Careers	-0.792
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.822
Presrv Heritage	0.541
Assist Citizens	-0.619
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.887
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.472
Sat Area Needs	-0.686
Keep Costs Down	-0.457
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.914
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.666
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.507
Just Rewd Prof	0.703
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.648
Position	
Mntn Quality	0.552

When we look at those universities that are in the top third -- universities that might fairly be called the great American universities -- we find a distinctive pattern of goals at such universities. They are universities which do emphasize student expressive goals. In them attention is given to producing a student who has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum, who has been permanently affected in mind and spirit by the great ideas of the great minds of history, and who has been assisted to develop objectivity about himself and examine his own beliefs critically. However the most prestigious universities do not give any more attention than any other universities to producing the well-rounded student, nor to developing the inner character of students. This does not mean that these goals are neglected, but rather that they simply are not given any more special attention than they are given anywhere else. In a sense then one can say that the parent who is interested in having his son's mind cultivated should send him to one of the top prestige universities; if he wants to make sure that he comes out a well-rounded student, then he has the same chance at such a university as he does at any other university. On the whole therefore, this adds up to a resounding vote in favor of the top prestige universities.

Student instrumental goals are not important except in a negative sense. Outside of the predictable goal of training students in scholarship and research, the only instrumental goals that come through are those of making a good consumer of the student and preparing him for a useful career, but these turn out to be correlated negatively with prestige. This means that they are positively de-emphasized in the better universities, which in turn means that they would be emphasized in the poorer universities. Of course this does not mean that there is any necessary causal relationship between producing useful careers, for example and prestige. A university does not attain top prestige by ignoring the attempt to prepare students for useful careers. On the contrary, we would guess that the top universities simply do not have to worry about the careers of their people perhaps because of their selectivity of students (note that the goal of accepting good students only is positvely correlated with prestige, Gamma .556). On the other hand the fact that there is a negative relationship rather than no relationship at all implies that this goal is always of little importance. Again we must remind the reader that we are talking about how goals are felt to be, not how people at the university feel they ought to be. In these universities in other words both administrators and faculty feel that this is a goal that is positively pushed into the background in comparison to other universities.

There is a similar lack of concern for satisfying a constituency in the negative relationship seen in the direct service goal of assisting citizens and in the adaptation goals of satisfying the areas needs, keeping costs down and maintaining the favorable appraisal of validating groups.

It is striking that the goal of emphasizing undergraduate instruction is negatively correlated (and very highly as can be seen) with prestige, at the same time the student expressive goals are positively related. The inference we would draw is that, the student's mind is to be affected in ways other than through undergraduate instruction. The emphasis on pure research as well as other indications suggest to us that student expressive goals are to be reached primarily through encouraging the student to do research, through his exposure to outstanding professors and through his taking charge of a great deal of his education himself.

When we turn to the positive Gammas, again we see that the great universities are those concerned with disseminating new ideas, preserving the cultural heritage, training people in scholarship and research, doing pure research, encouraging graduate study, seeing to it that professors are reward~~ing~~ed according to their contributions to their disciplines, protecting academic freedom and providing a maximum opportunity for professors to develop in ways that they think they should develop, insisting on a students right to inquire into things that interest him, and in most of the position goals (keeping up to date, maintaining quality in all things and maintaining or increasing the prestige of the institution.) This last would lead us to believe that the prestige is not simply something that lasts and lasts, but must be worked at all the time. There is as much concern about prestige in the great universities as there is in the lesser ones, who may be on the make.

The above analysis refers to the top third of the universities, when one compares the goal emphasis at them with the situation at other universities. When we turn to the data in the other table, we observe some important differences in the way in which the goals are organized within the great universities. We see, to begin with, that student expressive goals drop out. This means that although the top third of universities differ from others in that they also turn out to be the top third in emphasizing student intellect, affecting the student permanently, and developing student objectivity as we said, that within the great universities, the student expressive goals are not emphasized to a greater extent than are other goals. This is a way of saying that a parent that sends his son to such a place, though he will do much better on those activities than at other universities, on the other hand, he will not find that this is all that is being done to his son. Other goals are of even greater importance at those universities. These universities did not become great by giving special attention to students in any special way. Within the university the only goal that is emphasized over other goals that does involve the training of students is the goal of training people in scholarship and research. Again we see the overwhelming importance of research in the great universities.

We see however, that negative relationships again come to be important. The vocational goals do not take precedence over other goals. In the case of student careers, we see that that goal is positively de-emphasized to a very large extent (Gamma = -.792). In providing direct service they see themselves as disseminating ideas more than they do other goals and the same with preserving the heritage, but they are places in which assisting citizens to solve their problems is regarded as among the least important of goals. The adaptation goals, educating all students to the utmost, satisfying the areas needs, keeping costs down, and worrying about favorable appraisal are all negatively correlated, the last to a truly enormous extent (Gamma = -.914). The contrast between the negative value in educating to utmost all students and the positive value on accepting good students only underlines the selectivity of such universities.

So far as the management goals are concerned, the only two that are distinctive is "will of the faculty" and that the professor should be rewarded in accord with his contribution to his discipline. The latter is not surprising but this is one of the few times that the will of the faculty turns out to be an important goal. The great universities apparently are those in which care is taken to see to it that the will of the faculty prevails. Supporting this attention to the faculty is the attention given to providing maximum opportunity for the professor to develop in his own career. Finally we note the attention given to maintaining quality in those fields in which the university is especially good.

Volumes In Library and Goals

The data on volumes in the library and goals are presented in Tables 19 and 20.

Table 19

Volumes In Library and Goals:
Across Universities

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.600
Affct Stud Perm	0.578
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.690
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.585
Train Scholarshp	0.669
Stud Careers	-0.659
Direct Service	
Provd Spec Trng	-0.466
Dissemnt Ideas	0.651
Presrv Heritage	0.738
Assist Citizens	-0.508
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.735
Adaptation	
Hold Our Staff	0.504
Sat Area Needs	-0.585
Keep Costs Down	-0.680
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.497
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.456
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.443
Encourg Grad Wk	0.641
Just Rewd Prof	0.570
Undrgrad Instr	-0.644
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.601
Maxim Opportunity	0.760
Stud Pol Rights	0.447
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.647
Position	
Keep up to Date	0.639
Maintn Quality	0.616
Incrs U Prestige	0.519
Mntain Quality	0.590

Table 20
Volumes In Library and Goals:
Within Universities

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.562
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholrshp	0.726
Stud Good Citzn	-0.829
Stud Careers	-0.883
Direct Service	
Provd Spec Trng	-0.496
Dissemnt Ideas	0.788
Presrv Heritage	0.770
Assist Citizens	-0.654
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.660
Applied Research	-0.567
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.468
Sat Area Needs	-0.647
Keep Costs Down	-0.728
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.947
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.710
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.722
Motivation	
Prov Stud Activ	-0.549
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.593
Position	
Maintn Quality	0.591

We see here a striking confirmation of Cartter's finding that there is a high correlation between volumes in the library and university prestige. For our two tables are practically identical with the two tables presented showing the relationship between prestige and university goals. The evidence seems overwhelming that we are in the presence here simply of another measure of university prestige. We can regard these as validating findings. We find it impossible to accept the claim that our response rate could have been significantly biased for this large a number of findings could hardly have occured by chance. The very same relationships are found when one relates prestige to university goals are also found when one relates volumes in the library with university goals. Again it must be borne in mind that we are talking about the way goals are perceived not any feelings about what they ought to be.

Emphasis on Graduate Work and University Goals

The investigators thought it would be useful to secure a measure of the extent to which a university emphasizes graduate work and the character of the goals at that university. In some respects the emphasis on graduate work and graduate training is a distinctive mark of a university. This emphasis would distinguish all of our 68 universities from the approximately 2,000 institutions of higher education which have other major emphases. One way of describing our population, then, would be one in which graduate work is emphasized everywhere. However, it does not necessarily follow that they all emphasize the graduate work equally. So we felt it would be useful to look at those among whom it is a particularly important emphasis. These therefore are the universities which are ~~the~~ most distinctly universities.

We took as our measure of amount of emphasis on graduate work the percent of all students at the university who are graduate students. We use this partly because it is a relatively simple measure and partly because it was available for all universities. The major reason however, was that it did make sense and probably was as good a measure as any of the amount of emphasis on graduate work. The findings are presented in Tables 21 and 22.

Table 21

Per Cent Graduate Students and Goals:
Across Universities

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.614
Affct Stud Perm	0.600
Dvlp Stud Obj	0.756
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.523
Train Scholarshp	0.623
Stud Careers	-0.616
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.596
Presrv Heritage	0.470
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.474
Adaptation	
Educ To Utmost	-0.554
Sat Area Needs	-0.628
Keep Costs Down	-0.498
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.626
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.557
Just Rewd Prof	0.491
Undrgrad Instr	-0.591
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.669
Maxim Opportunty	0.673
Stud Pol Rights	0.453
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.614
Position	
Keep Up to Date	0.503
Maintn Quality	0.596
Incrs U Prestg	0.700
Mntain Quality	0.484

Table 22

Per Cent Grad Students and Goals:
Within Universities

Student-Expressive	
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.648
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholrshp	0.916
Stud Careers	-0.746
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.518
Assist Citizens	-0.597
Comm Cult Ldshp	-0.472
Research	
Applied Research	-0.560
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.578
Sat Area Needs	-0.602
Keep Costs Down	-0.518
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.714
Acc Gd Stud Only	0.756
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.565
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.674
Prov Stud Activ	-0.545
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.604
Position	

As may be seen, the results resemble those presented for prestige and for number of volumes in the university library. In some respects this is what one would have predicted since the most "university" of the universities would presumably be the most prestigious, for they would represent, in most highly developed form, the most cherished values of the university. The top 20 or so of the universities in terms of proportion of graduate students also turn out to be the top group in emphasizing student intellect, affecting the student permanently by the great ideas, and developing student objectivity. Like the great universities they are the universities in which training people in scholarship and research is highly emphasized and such matters as making a good consumer of the student or worrying about his career is positively de-emphasized. Universities see themselves as disseminating ideas and preserving the cultural heritage and, of course, as doing pure research. On applied research they are no different than universities which have smaller proportions of graduate students. They regard the position of the professor as being of first importance as one would have predicted, as may be seen in the emphasis given in protecting academic freedom, providing a maximum opportunity for the professor to develop in accord with his own conception with what he needs, and of maintaining top quality, keeping up to date and keeping prestige high, or increasing it.

One difference from the findings on prestige is that whereas universities ~~where~~ with high proportions of graduate students emphasize providing for the student's right to inquire into and examine critically any idea of programs they might get interested in just as was the case with the most prestigious universities, that where the proportion of graduate students is high, the other student political goal is also emphasized. The distinction between these two goals is that, in the case of the students right to inquire, they are simply talking about an intellectual right. On the other hand in the case of the second goal, they are talking about the student's actually participating. The reader may recall that the goal states "protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind, and any attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals." This goal was supported with a Gamma of .453 and it is particularly remarkable since this is one of the few times where the goal was seen as important. Perhaps we may be seeing here one of the effects of having on the campus a relatively high proportion of mature persons who, perhaps since they are of the more prestigious universities are beginning to see themselves and think of themselves as members of the faculty, who are their role models. Since the faculty emphasize academic freedom so much at such schools, (Gamma = .669), the emphasis on participation in political activities is one major way in which the students express the freedom that they feel that they should have. Again we cannot emphasize enough, that we are not talking about what anybody thinks should be the case but rather their belief as to what actually is the case. Places that have a high proportion of graduate students are provided the opportunity to participate and advocate political actions of their own choosing.

The second table, which presents the data on ranking of the goals within universities, again resembles the data for quality of the university. One exception is that here only one student expressive goal is found to be highly ranked in comparison to others -- the goal of developing student objectivity. We can only speculate of course, but this may be an effect of the large number of graduate students which in turn leads to a more strongly organized graduate student society with the development of strong identifications with their own disciplines.

Another difference is seen on the applied research dimension where universities with a high proportion of graduate students are also those in which applied research is positively de-emphasized (Gamma -.560) compared to other goals. Interestingly enough the goal of pure research is not emphasized over other goals within universities which have high proportions of graduate students. This of course does not mean that it is neglected, but simply that it is not treated any differently in the places which have high proportions of graduate students, ~~and~~ than what it is in places that have low proportions of graduate students.

As in the case of the prestige measures, we see the same group of adaptation goals and we see again one of the few cases where the will of the faculty as ~~the~~ A goal is found to correlate with ~~an~~other measures.

Motivation goals are more prominent here. For one thing the student's right to inquire is more directly emphasized in comparison to other goals, which fits in with the greater proportion of graduate students on the campus and we see a de-emphasis on the goal of providing student activity. The latter would confirm our earlier hunch that some of these findings are a reflection of the greater maturity of the graduate student body.

Location and University Goals

We found that location was not related to the kinds of goals that a university pursued. In the case of location we found that only one difference showed up in spite of 47 comparisons and this was the finding that giving the students a role in university government was more important in the East South Central and the Pacific regions than in other regions. However, since we use the 5% level of significance, 1 finding in 47 attempts is well within the bounds of chance and we do not place any credence in this finding.

When we compare universities located in metropolitan areas with those that were not, we found that the degree of emphasis on the importance of student involvement in the government of the university, the importance of assisting citizens, as through extension, and providing a full round of student activities all tended to be emphasized more highly in those universities located outside metropolitan areas, whereas the goal of increasing the university's prestige was emphasized in those universities in metropolitan more highly than those outside. Again, ~~only~~ ONly four findings from 47 attempts is close enough to ~~change~~ ChANCE so that these findings might well have turned up by chance alone.

CHAPTER 6

WHAT DO RESPONDENTS AT DIFFERENT KINDS OF UNIVERSITIES FEEL THAT THE GOALS SHOULD BE?

In Chapter 5 we were concerned with whether the goals of universities differ by type of university. Here we shift to the question not of what universities are like, but of what our respondents thought universities should be like. For example here we are not interested in whether in fact (according to the perceptions of our respondents) universities attempt to produce well rounded students. Instead we are interested in whether the personnel at the university thinks that the university ought to be producing well rounded students or not. Our measures are still organizational in the sense that we still characterize the university as low, medium, or high on each of these measures. We speak of them as "goal values".

Goal Values By Type of Control

Here we consider the question of whether there is any difference between private and state universities in the conceptions of the personnel of the goals that they should be pursuing. The major results are summarized in Table 23

Table 23

Goal Values By Global Type Control

Private		Across Universities	State	
		Student-Expressive		
Dvlp Stud Objct	(0.773)		Well Round Stud	(0.658)
		Student-Instrumental		
Train Scholrshp	(0.525)		Stud Taste	(0.626)
			Stud Good Citizn	(0.627)
			Stud Careers	(0.675)
		Direct Service		
			Provd Specl Trng	(0.780)
			Assist Citizens	(0.861)
			Comm Cult Ldshp	(0.501)
		Research		
			Applied Research	(0.718)
		Adaptation		
Acc Gd Stud Onl	(0.924)		Hold Our Staff	(0.697)
			Educ To Utmost	(0.924)
			Sat Area Needs	(0.668)
			Mntn Fav Apprsl	(0.511)
		Management		
			Stud Univ Govn	(0.553)
			Just Rewd Prof	(0.564)
		Motivation		
Protct Acd Frdm	(0.698)			
Maxim Opportunty	(0.675)			
		Position		
Maintn Quality	(0.814)			
Preserv Character	(0.724)			

Table 24

Goal Value By Global Type Control Within Universities

Private			Public	
Affct Stud Perm	(.585)	Student-Expressive		
Affct Stud Perm	(.585)		Well Round Stud	(.637)
		Student-Instrumental		
			Stud Good Citzn	(.716)
			Stud Careers	(.613)
		Direct Service		
Presrv Heritage	(.736)		Assist Citizn	(.916)
		Research		
			Applied Research	(.604)
		Adaptation		
Acc Gd Stud Onl	(.935)		Hold Our Staff	(.599)
			Educ to Utmost	(.930)
		Management		
Encourg Grad Wk	(.746)			
		Motivation		
Maxim Opportunty	(.729)			
Stud Pol Rights	(.714)			
		Position		

The first of these tables is to be read as follows. When the average rating for each of the goal values at our universities is ranged from high to low, private universities tend to be found more commonly in the top third of the distribution for those goal values listed in the first column, whereas state universities tend to be found more commonly among those values listed on the second column under "state". It may be seen that private universities tend to be found more commonly in the top third of distributions involving developing student objectivity, training people in scholarship and research, and accepting good students only (being selective). On the whole these are elitist goal values. We see this further confirmed when we note that no management goals are distinctive but the motivation goals that are distinctive emphasize the faculty rather than the students. They are: protecting academic freedom and providing maximum opportunity for the professors to develop in accord with their own conception of what is important. Private universities, to a much greater extent than state universities emphasize maintaining quality in all things they offer and preserving their distinctive character.

On the other hand the values associated with the state university are much more in accord with its mission as an organization which serves the community. We see evidence of a feeling that it ought to be concerned with student taste, making good citizens of students, and preparing them for useful careers. The state university should provide extension services, both through teaching and through assisting citizens and should be concerned with applied research. To a greater extent than the private universities it should be concerned with holding staff and with educating everyone who can qualify rather than being selective (with very high Gammas in contrast to the equally high Gammas for being selective in the case of private universities) with satisfying the area needs and with maintaining favorable appraisal of those who provide monies, which would be the legislature mostly. Students should be given a role in university government and professors rewarded in accord with their contributions to their own fields. This last is the only one that is to some extent out of line with the others. Finally, the well rounded student is felt to be a proper subject of emphasis which fits in with the traditional conception of the state university as involving the full program rather than concentrating on intellectual or classical goals.

When we examine the analysis within universities as shown in Table 24 we get a somewhat similar picture. Here goals are compared, not with the total distribution of all universities, but only with other goals at that university. Thus we may say that for private universities, persons are likely to rank affecting the student permanently with the great ideas of the great minds of history in the top third at those universities much more than they are likely to do so in the case of public universities. Hence falling in the top third at our private universities are goals that involve affecting the student permanently, preserving the cultural heritage, being selective (again we obtain a very high gamma, .935) encouraging students to go on with graduate work and providing maximum opportunity for the professors to pursue their own careers. On the other hand in public universities the top third is likely to have the well rounded student as a desirable emphasis, citizenship and careers of those students and helping the citizens directly and through applied research. We see the contrast in the adaptation goal of educating all students that qualify (gamma .930) in contrast to the complete opposite, the selective emphasis on the part of the private universities.

It is interesting that it is in the private universities that student political rights (involving actual advocacy) is likely to fall in the top third of things the professors and the administration feel ought to be emphasized. This is not to say that it is emphasized but it is only here that there is any feeling that it deserves emphasis. Note that the presence of a high gamma and a significant relationship or their absence does not mean that at a particular university it may not be felt to be an important value. At certain public universities it may be very important, but there is no relationship in public universities such that it tends generally to be important, whereas there is at private universities.

Size

As in previous analyses, the size of university (is measured by full-time staff, or number of full-time students) produced almost entirely negative results. There is only one relationship when full-time staff was used and that was with developing pride in the university (Gamma -.887); when full-time students are used as a measure of size, ~~than~~ then applied research (Gamma =.499) and encouraging graduate work Gamma = -.644) are found to be related to size. We regard these as results which certainly could have turned up by chance and make no attempt to interpret them.

Productivity

Productivity was measured by the number of doctorates produced and by the amount of contract research at the university.

Doctorates Production

The results on the relationship between doctorate production and goal values are presented in Tables 25 and 26.

Table 25

Goal Value Measure By Global Across Universities

Doctorates

Student-Expressive	
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Careers	-0.476
Direct Service	
Comm Cult Ldshp	-0.459
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.571
Adaptation	
Sat Area Needs	-0.534
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.509
Management	
Keep Harmony	-0.473
Ensur Univ Gls	-0.618
Undrgrad Instr	-0.463
Motivation	
Devlp Fac Lylty	-0.535
Dvlp Pride Univ	-0.654
Position	

Table 25

Goal Value Measure By Global

Within Universities
Doctorates

Student-Expressive	
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Research	
Pure Research	0.579
Adaptation	
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.542
Management	
Just Rewd Inst	-0.758
Fac Univ Govrn	0.648
Motivation	
Devlp Pride Univ	-0.814
Stud Pol Rights	0.908
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.665
Position	

Comparing universities with one another, we find that, over the whole table, almost all of the relationships are negative. This suggests that as the number of doctorates that a university gives tends to increase, certain goals tend to be de-valued. On the other hand the same goals of course will be highly valued where the number of doctorates is low. There seems then to be something inconsistent about doctorate production and the values indicated.

No student expressive values show up at all and, indeed, very few of any of the output goals. This suggests that as doctorate production increases, there is little effect on output as measured in any of the ways that we have attempted to measure it, which is perhaps a surprising conclusion since doctorates are themselves an output. But we can say that how many doctorates a university produces does not provide a good prediction of the emphasis the staff feels should be given to student goals nor to direct service nor to research. Perhaps this last statement needs some ammendments, since doing pure research _is_ found to be positively related to doctorate production. In the case of the others, the only relationships are with student careers and with community cultural leadership, and these are negative.

As doctorate production goes up universities pay less and less attention to satisfying the areas needs and maintaining the favorable appraisal of validating groups. There is less attention also to keeping harmony, to emphasizing undergraduate instruction, worrying about faculty loyalty or developing pride in the university. Here note again that this is how people feel things _ought_ to be.

One other interesting finding relates to the management goal of making sure that the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible. This is the first case we have had where this goal has been found to be related to anything. It should be noticed that we obtain a negative gamma of -.618 -- a high one.

The findings suggest that as doctorate production increases there is less of a feeling that a university ought to be run by those who can run it in the most efficient manner possible. An interest in efficiency in other words seem to be important only in places that have low doctorate production.

When we turn to the second of the tables, presenting analysis among goal values at a particular university, we notice a smaller number of relationships. Pure research still remains present and high, meaning that in those universities with large amounts of doctorate produciton, there is a feeling that pure research ought to be important. We observe several negative relationships particularly with reference to maintaining the favorable appraisal of validating groups and developing pride in the university. We notice a negative relationship also with rewarding the person in accord with his contribution to the university (rather than his contribution in his own career). As doctorate production goes up there is then less concern with a man's contribution to the university, since perhaps doctorate production itself is the activity of cosmopolitans who are more interested in contributions to their field than they are in contributions to the university.

Contract Research Services

Our second measure of productivity was the volume of contract research services. The major findings are presented in Tables 27 and 28.

Table 27

(Goal Value Measure)

GVM By Global Contract Research Services Across Universities

Student-Expressive	
Well Round Stud	-0.557
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.497
Stud Good Citizen	-0.453
Stud Careers	-0.561
Direct Service	
Assist Citizens	-0.480
Comm Cult Ldshp	-0.511
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.665
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.451
Sat Area Needs	-0.455
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.453
Acc Gd Stud Only	0.556
Management	
Ensur Univ Gls	-0.537
Undrgrad Instr	-0.494
Motivation	
Protect Acd Frdm	0.533
Dvlp Pride Univ	-0.472
Position	

Table 28

GVM By Global Contract Research Services Within Universities

Student-Expressive	
Stud Character	-0.578
Well Round Stud	-0.571
Direct Service	
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.795
Adaptation	
Hold Our Staff	-0.501
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.667
Management	
Just Rewd Inst	-0.645
Fac Univ Gov Rn	0.702
Motivation	
Position	

When we look at the data in the table which reports on comparisons across universities, we see that practically all the relationships are negative. This means that as the volume of contract research services goes up in a university there is a feeling that certain goals should be emphasized less. On the other hand it may be said that where these goals are not considered important values, then there is a relatively small volume of contract research services. As the volume of contract research service goes up, universities, compared to each other, will emphasize less producing well rounded students, worrying about the student consumer or making a good citizen of the student or his career. Consistently the university staff also tends to feel that assisting citizens and providing community cultural leadership are less important, as well as satisfying the local area needs, maintaining the favorable appraisal of validating bodies (perhaps because they ~~are~~ have an assured supply of money from contract research), and with undergraduate instruction. Pride in the university is felt to be of lesser importance also, a consequence perhaps of a tendency for places that have a lot of contract research to be more prestigous and therefore perhaps having less to worry about as far as university pride is concerned.*

On the other hand, as one would have predicted, doing pure research tends to be regarded as a goal that ought to be important as indeed it must be if the university is doing very much contract research.

---

*The above paragraph has been written from a "dynamic" point of view, as if we were actually examining what happens to a university as the volume of contract research is increased. Of course, our data permit us only to compare universities with different amount of contract research. Our statement of conclusions might then partake of the form: "At those universities where volume of contract research is high, it is felt that certain goals should be emphasized." and so forth.

In the second table, which analyzes the way in which values are related to one another within the university, we observe a rather different picture. Although apparently when one compares universities with one another certain goal values are much more likely to be less important as contract research services goes up comparatively, such seems much less to be the case when we compare goal values with one another. To take an illustration although there is a tendency to feel that there should be a de-emphasis of the importance of satisfying area needs as contract research goes up this does not seem to be true within the university. What happens is that those universities that do a great deal of contract research will be found to comparatively neglect satisfying the area needs * compared to other universities. However within universities, whether a place has a lot of contract research does not mean that it will neglect area needs in comparison to other needs. This goal is as likely to be found in the upper third of the goals people feel ought to be emphasized as it is in the middle or lower third. On the other hand, producing the well rounded student and making students into good citizens are, as they were for the previous analysis, in the bottom third of goals. So too, the goals of doing pure research and accepting good students only hold up as being not only in the top third of the universities, but also in the top third of the goals at those universities that emphasize alot of contract research. Within such universities too, we note the interesting fact that there is a feeling that the university should be governed by the faculty. This is one of the very few times that this goal value turned up at all. Apparently only when there is alot of contract research is there a feeling on the part of the faculty that they should be given a bigger share in the running of the university.

Of course some contract research may involve serving the region directly.

QUALITY OF THE UNIVERSITY AND GOAL VALUES

Prestige and Goal Values

The data on the prestige of universities in relation to goal values are presented in Tables 29 and 30.

Table 29

GVM By Global Prestige

Across Universities

Student-Expressive	
Stud Character	-0.547
Well Round Stud	-0.639
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.569
Stud Good Citzn	-0.463
Stud Careers	-0.598
Direct Service	
Provd Spec Trng	-0.453
Dissemnt Ideas	0.455
Assist Citizens	-0.526
Comm Cult Ldshp	-0.461
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.734
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.463
Sat Area Needs	-0.603
Keep Costs Down	-0.531
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.580
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.521
Management	
Keep Harmony	-0.598
Ensur Univ Gls	-0.575
Just Rewd Instr	-0.519
Undrgrad Instr	-0.549
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.543
Maxim Opportunty	0.521
Develop Pride Univ	-0.578
Position	

Table 30

GVM By Global Prestige Within Universities

Student-Expressive	
Stud Character	-0.559
Well Round Stud	-0.784
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Careers	-0.619
Direct Service	
Presrv Heritage	0.507
Assist Citizens	-0.620
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.684
Adaptation	
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.580
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.725
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.769
Just Rewd Instr	-0.792
Fac Univ Govrn	0.751
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.555
Devlp Pride Univ	-0.825
Stud Pol Rights	0.951
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.895
Position	

Two features of Table 29 stand out. First we note that the output goals almost balance the support goals. Second, we notice the very high proportion of negative findings. On the first of these features, apparently the variable of prestige seems to affect rather strongly people's conceptions of what the output goals of the university ought to be as much as they affect what they think the support goals ought to be. Perhaps persons have stronger opinions as prestige goes up about what the university ought to be doing. Whatever the reason such opinions do turn up more strongly than was the case with the goal analysis presviously. On the other hand the large number of negative relationships suggests that the high prestige schools are places in which persons feel that certain things should not be done. When one asks, what do these schools feel ought to be done, our findings would suggest that opinions here are more divided to the point where a very small number of significant relationships emerge. We can say that at the more prestigious places, the values ranked as the most worthy goals are those of disseminating ideas, protecting academic freedom, and providing maximum opportunity for faculty to develop. At the prestigious universities there is a feeling that they should not give high priority to the goal of student character development or to producing a well rounded student, to the making a good consumer of the student and indeed to all the other goal values associated with the land grant principle and the service principle. They are places in which a person should be doing research and in which adaptation goals should not be so important, nor management goals. This does not mean that they think all adaptation goals or all management goals should be unimportant, but simply that whenever an adaptation or management goals is singled out it tends to be negatively associated with prestige.

The picture tends to be confirmed in the analysis within universities as offered in the second table, Table 30. The same student-expressive goals are negatively related to prestige, meaning that they tend to be found in the bottom group at the most prestigious universities, and the same with emphasizing student careers. The will of the faculty here shows up whereas it did not in the across university comparisons, as well as involving the faculty in university government. As in the case in the findings on contract research, we notice that when students do come into the picture positively, it is the staff at the more prestigious universities who feel their political rights and their right to inquire ought to be emphasized.

Volumes In Library

Our second measure of quality was volumes in the library. The findings are presented in Tables 31 and 32.

Table 31

GVM By Global Volumes In Library

Across Universities

Student-Expressive	
Stud Character	-0.653
Well Round Stud	-0.641
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.796
Stud Good Citizn	-0.634
Stud Careers	-0.581
Direct Service	
Provd Spec Trng	-0.491
Assist Citizens	-0.541
Comm Cult Ldshp	-0.545
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.764
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.500
Sat Area Needs	0.524
Keep Costs Down	-0.611
Acc Gd Stud Only	0.467
Management	
Keep Harmony	-0.595
Ensur Univ Gls	-0.477
Just Rewd Inst	-0.509
Undrgrad Instr	-0.577
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.591
Maxim Opportunty	0.600
Provd Stud Activ	-0.444
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.581
Position	

Table 32

GVM By Global Volumes In Library Within Universities

Student-Expressive	
Stud Character	-0.740
Well Round Stud	-0.750
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Good Citizen	-0.571
Stud Careers	-0.725
Direct Service	
Presrv Heritage	0.629
Assist Citizens	-0.578
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.756
Adaptation	
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.748
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.582
Encourg Grad Wk	0.634
Just Rewd Inst	-0.845
Fac Univ Govern	0.530
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.670
Devlp Pride Univ	-0.732
Stud Pol Rights	0.780
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.857
Position	

When these two tables are compared with the two tables reporting results on prestige, the results are practically identical. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that volumes in the library is closely correlated with university prestige and that the same goal values ought to show up here as show up when one measures prestige. We see the same heavy emphasis on output goals and the very high proportion of negative findings as before, with very likely similar interpretations. Something apparently happens to values when prestige goes up, but the tendency is for certain values which are important to people at the less prestigious institutions to be dropped or shifted. There are some real differences by prestige in what persons at universities think is important.

Emphasis On Graduate Work

We attempted to measure the extent to which the university emphasized graduate work, by using as a measure, the proportion of all students who are graduate students. Our results are presented in Tables 33 and 34 for goal values.

Table 33

GVM By % Grad Students Across Universities

Student-Expressive	
Well Round Stud	-0.597
Dvlp Stud Object	0.544
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.596
Gv Stud Suc Fac	-0.622
Stud Good Citzn	-0.500
Stud Careers	-0.649
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.523
Assist Citizens	-0.468
Research	
Applied Research	-0.446
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.597
Sat Area Needs	-0.504
Keep Costs Down	-0.481
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.581
Management	
Keep Harmony	-0.444
Ensur Univ	-0.460
Just Rewd-Prof	-0.586
Undrgrad Instr	-0.445
Fac Univ Govrn	-0.446
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.634
Maxim Opportunty	0.576
Prov Stud Activ	-0.451
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.503
Position	
Maintn Quality	0.529

Table 34

GVM By Global % Graduate Students Within Universities

Student-Expressive	
Affct Stud Perm	0.564
Well Round Stud	-0.792
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Careers	-0.698
Direct Service	
Presrv Heritage	0.658
Assist Citizns	-0.669
Comm Cult Ldshp	-0.579
Research	
Adaptation	
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.801
Management	
Just Rewd Inst	-0.655
Fac Univ Govrn	0.631
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.669
Stud Pol Rights	0.800
Position	

When one compares those places which have a high proportion of graduate students with those that do not on the goal values of their faculty and staff, the results tend to resemble our findings on prestige also, but there are differences. We notice, ~~that~~ to begin with, the relatively high proportion of negative findings. This means that in those schools where the proportion of graduate students to the total student body is high, certain goals are considered as deserving of low priority. A relatively high proportion of our support goals are in this category. Such goals, for example, as accepting all students, or satisfying area needs, or keeping cost down are of low order in these schools. Since support goals are often felt to be improper major emphases of universities, our respondents are in effect saying to us, let us not let support goals be important as the proportion of graduate students goes up. Let us not, for example, worry about accepting all students because citizens expect us to. Let us not worry about satisfying the area needs because we need their money. Let us not worry about keeping costs down, at least let that not be a major goal here compared to other places where they have a smaller proportion of graduate students. Let us not get hung up on problems of keeping harmony or of undergraduate instruction, or of providing student activities because we need the students. So too, let us not worry about the student's taste or helping him get ahead in the world, making a good citizen of him, or giving him a useful career, or helping citizens. Let us not worry about even applied research. The few things that we ought to worry about more than other places are things like developing student objectivity, disseminating ideas, involving the faculty in university government, protecting academic freedom, providing maximum opportunity for the faculty to develop in their own careers, and maintaining high quality in everything we do.

A smaller number of emphases is felt to be appropriate within the university, as may be seen in Table 34. Here there are about as many positive as negative findings. The things that should not be in the top third are producing the well rounded student, or worrying about his career, providing community cultural leadership, rewarding people in accord with their own contribution to the university. Instead the staff thinks about affecting the student permanently with the great ideas, about preserving the cultural heritage, about being selective in deciding who is let in, involve the faculty in the government, helping the faculty with their careers and supporting students in their efforts to advocate such political ideas as they think proper.

On the whole these findings suggest not so much the mature student body that we found in the earlier analysis of goals in relation to proportion of graduate students but rather that there does seem to be a different atmosphere at places in which there is a high proportion of graduate students. The values are definitely different than places that have a low proportion of graduate students and the faculty and administration have more definite ideas of the kind of place their university ought to be.

Goal Values By Location and Region

We obtain no findings at all in differences by goal values by region. However, there were findings showing goal values differing according to location, that is according to whether a university was located in an urban or in a rural place. The findings are shown in Tables 35 and 36.

Table 35

GVM By Global Location

Across Universities

Student-Expressive	
Devlp Stud Objct	-0.735
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholarshp	-0.571
Gv Stud Suc Fac	0.531
Stud Careers	0.571
Direct Service	
Provd Spec Traing	0.542
Assist Citizens	0.636
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.579
Acc Gd Stud Only	0.740
Management	
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	-0.623
Stud Pol Rights	-0.568
Prov Stud Activ	0.578
Position	
Keep Up to Date	0.620

Table 36

GVM By Global Location Within Universities

Student-Expressive	
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Good Citzn	0.922
Stud Careers	0.750
Direct Service	
Presrv Heritage	-0.810
Assist Citizns	0.698
Research	
Applied Research	0.650
Adaptation	
Acc Gd Stud Onl	-0.875
Management	
Motivation	
Position	

A minus finding means that the value is important in urban areas and a positive finding that it is important in rural. Thus in urban areas we find a feeling that there should be greater emphasis on developing student objectivity, training students in scholarship and research, protecting academic freedom and student political rights. In rural locations there is a greater emphasis on providing upward mobility opportunities, and assisting students with their careers, the extension goals, accepting all students and doing what one can with them, providing student activity and keeping up to date.

The significance of a rural location may be associated with the land grant phenomenon. This is one of the few areas of analysis in which student activities are rated as something that one should worry about.

The situation is similar with the internal measures. Here again producing good citizens and emphasizing student careers, assisting citizens in doing applied research tend to be found in the rural areas (with very high gammas) preserving the cultural heritage and being selective about students tends to be found in the urban.

Looking back over our findings on goal values we do observe a distinct configuration of replies, rather different from the picture for goals. To begin with, private and state universities do turn out to be quite different kinds of animals with the values that are supposed to be associated with state universities coming through quite strongly and private universities being their reputed elitist selves. We observe a tendency for measures as diverse as doctorate production, contract research, prestige, volumes in the library and proportion of graduate students all tending to point in similar directions. In all cases we observe a rather strong tendency for output goal values to be emphasized, and a high proportion of all values to be negative. As universities get better or emphasize doctorate production more they seem to be more concerned with opposing certain values than they are with supporting them. Taking a guess, based on our own experience as well as some of our interviews, we might infer that as a university gets better its staff gets more independent; that it had put up with a great many things that it did not want to put up with when its prestige was low. When it gets more independent, in effect saying: we will not stand for these things we had to stand for any longer. They do more research and think they should.

CHAPTER 7

THE POWER STRUCTURE OF UNIVERSITIES

It was the hope of the investigators that the findings might shed some light on the power structure of universities. "Power structure" is, perhaps, a leading term since it implies that there is a structure there. By "structure" we mean a relatively enduring distribution of power such that certain persons or certain parts of the university tend uniformly to have more power than other parts. Whether this is the case remains to be tested.

We attempted to get at power indirectly by asking our subject who, in their opinion made the major decisions at the university. We asked several questions (2.2 and 2.3 in the questionaire) but we are reporting here on the findings from 2.1 only because it was a key question and gets at power better than anything else might have on a questionaire. The question, as it appeared on the questionnaire is, presented below.

WHO MAKE THE BIG DECISIONS

2.1 Think again of the kind of place this university is; that is, what its major goals or distinctive emphases are. Below are listed a number of positions and agencies. In each case, indicate by a check mark in the appropriate space how much say you believe persons in those positions have in affecting the major goals of the university. Note we are asking only about the university as a whole. A man might have a lot of say in his own deparment, but not in the university as a whole.

Table 36

	a great deal of say	quite a bit of say	some say	very little say	no say at all
The regents (or trustees)	___	___	___	___	___
Legislators	___	___	___	___	___
Sources or large private grants or endowments	___	___	___	___	___
Federal government agencies or offices	___	___	___	___	___
State government agencies or offices	___	___	___	___	___
The President	___	___	___	___	___
The vice-presidents (or provosts)	___	___	___	___	___
Dean of the graduate school	___	___	___	___	___
Dean of liberal arts	___	___	___	___	___
Deans of professional school as a group	___	___	___	___	___
Chairmen of departments, considered as a group	___	___	___	___	___
The faculty, as a group	___	___	___	___	___
The students, as a group	___	___	___	___	___
Parents of students, as a group	___	___	___	___	___
The citizens of the state as a group	___	___	___	___	___
Alumni, as a group	___	___	___	___	___

The respondent put a check mark next to the appropriate powerholder indicating how much say he felt that the person or group of persons had. This procedure enabled us to calculate a score for each powerholder.

Who Make the Big Decisions

We thought it worthwhile to put all our findings together and produce an overall average which would give us a picture of who are perceived as having the power when all 68 universities are considered together. We recognize that there may be variations among universities and we shall give attention to those variations below (although there are not as many of those as many would think). But it is worthwhile to look at this system of universities and see who come out, on the average, at the top and at the bottom. The findings are presented in Table 37.

Table 37

Who Make the Big Decisions

Rank Order

	Average Score	Stand. Dev.
President	4.65	0.62
Regents	4.37	0.82
Vice President	4.12	0.82
Deans of profess. Schools	3.62	0.84
Dean of Grad. School	3.59	0.89
Dean of Liberal Arts	3.56	0.89
Faculty	3.31	0.97
Chairmen	3.19	0.93
Legislators	2.94	1.37
Federal Government	2.79	1.06
State Government	2.72	1.21
Large Private Donors	2.69	1.06
Alumni	2.61	0.90
Students	2.37	0.82
Citizens of State	2.08	1.02
Parents	1.91	0.87

In the table the average scores have been arranged in sequence from high to low. As may be seen, for example, presidents are everywhere perceived as being powerful figures. The M = 4.65 is very high indeed and implies that presidents are widely perceived as having "a great deal of say".

The top powerholders in American universities are the president, the regents and the vice presidents all of whom have average scores of well over four, that is above the figure we used for "quite a bit of say". It is also noteworthy that the standard deviation of these scores is low, indicating a high degree of consensus on the part of our respondents on these three great powerholders. At the other end we see that students, citizens of the state and parents are all perceived as having much less power. We do however see a large spread in the case of citizens of the state (standard deviation = 1.02) indicating some disagreement on this one. The disagreement does not reflect necessarily internal disagreement at a particular university but very likely reflects the fact that citizens of the state are perceived as being much less important as powerholders in the private universities than is the case in the state universities. A similar reasoning very likely accounts for the high standard deviations reported for legislators, the federal government and the state government and large private donors. The first three are particularly important in state universities and the last in private universities. On the whole when we look at the standard deviations they tend to be relatively low or else those that have high dispersions can be readily explained. We were able to conclude that there was a high degree of consensus on the power position of the persons or groups about which we asked our respondents.

Few readers will be surprised that presidents ranked at the top. After all they are the chief executives of their organizations, are so perceived by students, faculty, and citizens, and it would be extraordinary if they were perceived as men who had relatively little say. There seems no question that we are dealing with an elite group about which there is little disagreement on how much say they have.

Even "weak" presidents, our findings suggest, are perceived as men who are simply not doing their job. They have the power, but for some reason are not using it.

More surprising is the high rating accorded "regents". Our informal interviews including responses which we received from regents, as well as letters we received from them,suggested that regents do not perceive themselves as having a great deal of power. In much of the literature in this area too, regents are perceived as having formal power in the sense that the ultimate power is theirs, but they in fact rarely use it. They let the president run the university and the only major decision regents make is that of selecting a new president. It is entirely possible for men to serve on the board of regents of universities and never be called upon to participate in the choice of the president. The meetings of regents are often purely routine affairs with the regents being regarded as persons who should be helpful in securing needed monies for the operation of the university. It might not be surprising that the faculty would see the regents as having a lot of power, but apparently administrators do also. Perhaps the question itself tended to push regents up: we asked who made the big decisions. Although the regents select a president rarely, there seems no question that that would be a big decision when it has to be carried out. Although this may be the case, we strongly suspect that it is not the major factor operating. The regents are a nebulous group that sit in judgement once a month and it may be the very mysteriousness of their position that leads persons to think of them as having a great deal of power*. The vice-president is also a distant figure and we suspect that he is sharing here in the power which persons associate with the president.

---

*Regents in American universities are also "outsiders" in contrast to the situation in some Canadian and British universities. This contrast is brought out in University Government in Canada, Report of a Commission Sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, Commission: Sir James Duff and Professor Robert O. Berdahl, University of Toronto Press, 1966.

The fact that deans of professional schools are ranked above all other deans will add grist to the mill of those who feel that the deans of professional schools are becoming too powerful. Such deans have manifold contacts in the community and there is no question of justifying what they are doing for the state or the people of the country. Certain professional schools are very large, particularly education, the professional schools associated with agriculture, physical education, and the School of Business Administration, and this may be another part of the picture. The position of the dean of the graduate school is perhaps predictable since we are dealing with universities, but what is perhaps surprising is not that he is so high, but that the Dean of Liberal Arts is so high.

Shifting to the other end of the distribution we see that all of the persons that many fear or think about in Machievllian terms are perceived as having very little influence on the big decisions in the university. None of the large private donors, alumni, students, citizens of the state, or parents are felt to make any significant difference at all in the running of the university. The Federal Government, often feared and suspected of interfering too much, occupies a middling position but towards the bottom. On the whole this supports the finding of Orlans* in his study of the impact of Federal grants on universities. Legislators have a position right in the middle, a reflection of the average which results when their relatively high position in state universities is averaged with their low position in private universities.

The faculty and chairmen (and many people regard chairmen as being faculty) also occupy a middling position, but we suspect that there is no difference here between private and state universities. It is a middling position but towards the top. What is interesting here is that faculty score above chairmen is terms of influence on the big decisions. We see here a tendency for chairmen to be regarded as agents of the faculty. There does, then, not seem to be any clear hierarchy going from faculty to chairmen to deans.

---

*Harold Orlans, Effect of Federal Programs on Higher Education, Wash. D. C., Brookings Institute, 1962.

Power Structure and University Characteristics

We turn attention next to the way in which the power structure varies as between universities of different kinds. We use the characteristics already described for the goal analysis: type of control, size, productivity, prestige, the emphasis of graduate work, and the region and location of the university.

Power Structure and Type of Control

The question that we address ourselves to here is: how do private and state universities differ from one another in the persons or groups who are perceived as making the big decisions. The major findings are presented in Table 38.

Table 38

Power Structure and Type Control

Across Universities

Private

Private Agencies	(.819)
Dean Lib Arts	(.573)
Deans Prof. School	(.501)

State

Regents	(.575)
Federal Govt	(.746)
State Govt	(.992)
Parents	(.573)
Legislators	(1.000)
Citizens	(1.000)

Power Structure and Type Control

Within Universities

Private

Private Agencies	(.944)
Students	(.814)
Alumni	(.878)

State

State Govt	(.963)

As we can see, some striking differences are in evidence and support some of the guesses that we made in our discussion in the previous section. We note that when universities are put down in order from those in which private agencies or sources of funds are perceived as having the greatest amount of power to those in which they are perceived as having the least amount of power that there is a definite relationship between that distribution and whether a university is private or state. We see that it is the private universities that tend to predominate in the top third of the distribution. They are places in which private agencies are perceived as having a great deal of say over the major decisions made in the university. So too, it is apparently in private universities that deans of Liberal Arts and deans of professional schools are also the major powerholders in comparison to the way the situation is at other universities. On the other hand when we look at state universities we see that they tend to be found in the upper third of the distribution of powerholders when we are talking about Regents, the Federal Government, State Government, parents, legislators, and citizens. (The Gammas of 1 for legislators and citizens do indicate a very strong relationship although the existence of a 1 is to some extent an artifact of the presence of zeros in some of the cells.)

The bottom part of the table makes a comparison of powerholders within universities. We find that in private universities, private agencies are likely to be ranked as having more power than any of the other powerholders (Gamma = .994). Here too we observe the surprising finding that although students and alumni are in general rated as having little power across the whole prospective of American universities, when one looks within private universities students and alumni are felt to have more power than do other powerholders at those institutions. We note however and must underline this point, the situation we are describing is a comparative one between private and state. The finding means that students are perceived as having more power than the other potential powerholders in private universities in comparison to the situation at state universities. The difference in other words between students and those that score below them is sufficiently great to produce a highly significant finding. Another way of putting it is: when the powerholders at each university are ranked in order, in private universities alumni and students are likely to fall in the upper one third, whereas in state universities there is no clear location in which they fall, they may be found anywhere in the distribution. In contrast in state universities state government tends always to be in the upper one third of the distribution.

The statement is sometimes made that private and state universities are growing more alike and perhaps they are in terms of the assumption of responsibility and the growth and importance of the universities as a whole in the society. Our data here, though, suggests that ~~they~~ there remain important and large differences between them. Thus our previous finding that deans of professional schools were ranked relatively high across the board must be amended to note that it is particularly in the private universities that they are ranked high. Since they rank high across the board this means that in the state universities deans of professional schools might have much less power. A similar statement is true of deans of liberal arts.

Power Structure and Size

As we found in our analysis of goals, the size of the university, whether measured by number of students or number of staff does not seem to correlate highly with any variables that we investigated. It does not relate itself to the power structure in any way except in a few cases. The results are given in Table 39.

Table 39

Power Structure and No. of Students and Staff

Across Universities

No. of Students	
Vice-Presidents	.451
Staff	
Vice-President	.530
Students	-.455

Power Structure and No. of Students and Staff

Within Universities

No Findings

As may be seen from the previous table, in the large universit~~y~~ies vice-presidents ~~and~~ Are perceived as being more important in making the critical decisions whereas students are seen as being of little importance. We make no speculation about the significance of this variable except possibly, as universities become larger the vice-president becomes a more important figure because the president is forced to become more of an outside man (that is concern himself with the position of the university with reference to the community and potential donors. This however is pure guesswork since the findings are so small in number they could even have been produced by chance.

Power Structure and Productivity

When number of doctorates was used as a measure of productivity we did not find a single significant relationship. Since this was a variable of importance with other measures we conclude that a university's position as a doctorate producer is not related to the kind of power structure it has.

When the other measure of productivity, contract research, is employed our findings are not much more impressive. The volume of contract research is found to be related to the power of chairman (Gamma = .516) and to the power of alumni. (Gamma = .476) Again one can speculate about the significance of these findings, but they are so sparse that we prefer to pass them by.

Power Structure and Quality

The findings for quality are not large in number but when we put together both the prestige measure and the volumes in the library measure the number of findings is worth looking at. They are presented in Table 40.

Table 40

Power Structure and Quality

Power Structure and Prestige

Across Universities

Vice-President	.462
Chairmen of Depts	.485

Within Universities

Chairmen of Depts	.867

Power Structure and Volumes In Library

Across Universities

Deans of Liberal Arts	.531
Chairmen of Depts.	.554
Faculty	.569

Within Universities

Faculty	.770

It may be seen here that when universities are arranged in order of prestige the most prestigious ones are those in which the vice-president and chairmen of departments are perceived as having a great deal of say. We think this is likely related to the important role which chairmen play in freeing persons for research and other activities which are directly related to prestige. The finding is supported within the university as well. That is when powerholders are ranged within universities into thirds the chairmen tend to fall in the top third in the most prestigious universities. We can say then that the better universities are those in which chairmen are perceived as having power.* The finding receives further confirmation when we use as our measure of quality, number of volumes in the library as can be seen from the table (Gamma = .554). It is also noteworthy that the faculty here are perceived as being powerful both in the analysis which crosses university lines and in ~~a~~ the situation where we compare faculty to other powerholders within universities. We observe, too, that deans of liberal arts, which many persons do not think of as great powerholders and who did not show up among the top group when we looked at all universities, do show up among those that have a high number of volumes in the library, a reflection of quality.

Emphasis on Graduate Work

The findings on emphasis on graduate work, ~~is~~ as measured by proportion of students that are graduate students, are presented in Table 41.

---

*Since a relatively high proportion of our administrator respondents were chairmen, further specification of this inference is clearly called for. If chairmen at the more prestigious universities over-rate their own power, the net effect would be to favor the overall rating at such universities. ~~Such analysis is presently under way~~.

Table 41

Power Structure and Percent Grad. Students

Across Universities

Legislators	-.529
Private Agencies	.626
State Government	-.589

Within Universities

Legislators	-.536
State Government	-.623
Faculty	.445
Citizens	-.483

As can be seen the proportion of graduate students is apparently associated with distinct kinds of power structure. As the proportion of graduate students increases in a university, private agencies take on more and more power whereas the power of legislators and state government tends to fall. Since it is not true that the private universities differ from state universities in proportion of graduate students these findings do seem to be related to the degree of emphasis on graduate study. It would be hazardous to conclude that the power of legislators and state government necessarily interferes with the growth of graduate emphasis, but it does appear that graduate emphasis tends not to be found in those places in which legislators and state government tend to have a great deal of power. Of course this would not include private universities as such, but it also includes those state universities in which legislators and state government do not have much power.

Within universities one sees a confirmation of these findings. Legislators and state government as well as citizens do not turn up in the top third of powerholders within the university when the proportion of graduate students is small. As it increases they tend to fade away as powerholders and the faculty emerges as typically in the top third.

Power Structure and Region and Location

In one of the very few times this is true we find that the power structure does differ by the region of the university and by location (metropolitan area or not). In particular we obtain the findings outlined in the following table.

Table 42

Power Structure and Region and Location

Region

Across		Within	
Regents	.536	Private Agencies	-.471
Vice-Pres.	-.428		
Parents	.458		

Location

Legislators	.785 (Rural)	Legislators	.713 (Rural)
State Govt.	.687 (Rural)	Private Agencies	-.746 (Urban)
Citizens	.787 (Rural)	State Govt.	.839 (Rural)

The table in itself requires interpretation.

There it may be ~~seen~~ shown that regents are seen as having low power in those universities in the Mid-Atlantic states and as having relatively high power in those universities in the South, in the West North Central states, and in the Mountain and Pacific states. Vice-presidents tend to have more power comparatively in the Northeast, the Mid-Atlantic and the East North Central states and to have less power in the Southern states and the Pacific Coast states. Parents, as a group, turn out to be perceived as having low power generally, but in contrast to the usual power picture relatively high power in the East North Central states, the West South Central states, and surprisingly in the pacific coast states. Finally when we examine the picture within universities we find that private agencies tend to have high power in the Northeast and Atlantic states, in the West North Central, and in the West North Central states and to have less power in the East North Central states and the Mountain states. We are not at all sure how these results are to be interpreted, but we expect that they reflect the traditional differences in the power of the regents and in general of citizens in the Midwestern states in contrast to the relative autonomy enjoyed by universities on the Eastern Seaboard.

Location relationships show that legislators, state government and citizens tend to be perceived as the major powerholders in rural areas a finding which is confirmed when the analysis is made within universities and these powerholders are compared to one another in the case of legislators and state government. The only relationship found that favors the urban universities is that of private agencies. The meaning here is that when powerholders are arranged within each university in order from low to high the private agencies tend to fall in the upper third more commonly in the urban universities. There is some tendency for the private and more prestigious universities to be urban and this may be what is being reflected here.

On looking back over our findings that attempt to relate our global measures to the power structure of the universities, we come away feeling that the power structure does not vary as much among universities as many would think. The only variable of any importance seems to be whether the university is private or public and this affects the role primarily of public agencies such as the legislators, the state government, and the citizens as one would predict. On the whole then we make the cautious inference that the power structure of American universities is remarkably uniform.

CHAPTER 8

HOW DO UNIVERSITIES WITH DIFFERENT GOAL EMPHASES DIFFER IN POWER STRUCTURE?

In the previous chapter we attempted to get some idea of who were perceived to be the persons or groups that make the major decisions at universities and whether there are any differences between universities in the pattern of power. In this chapter we attack the question of whether such differences make a difference. That is, where the power structure of universities differ, do we tend to find that these universities are different kinds of places as reflected in the sort of goals that they pursue at those universities.

We made use of both of our goal measures -- that is those that rank universities in terms of the importance of each goal and those that rank each goal within the university as it compares to all other goals. And we made use also of our two analagous power measures -- we are interested in how the power of regents compares in different universities and also how regents are perceived to be compared to other power holders such as legislators and the faculty. We relate each of these measures to the other. Thus there will be four types of analysis: we will relate the external and internal goal measures to the external power structure and then relate the external and internal goal measures to the internal power measures.

GOALS AND POWER STRUCTURE: COMPARISON OF THE RANKING OF THE GOALS BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES AND WITHIN UNIVERSITIES WITH THE POWER STRUCTURE BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES.

We give our attention first of all to the power of the regents.

REGENTS AND GOALS

The findings are presented in Tables 43 and 44.

Table 43

Goals Across and Power Structure Across

Regents

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.449
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.463
Management	
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	-0.501
Stud Pol Rights	-0.453
Stud Rgt Inquir	-0.492
Position	

Table 44

Goals Within and Power Structure Across

Regents

Student-Expressive	
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.543
Keep Costs Down	0.495
Management	
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	-0.497
Stud Rgt Inquir	-0.509
Position	

The tables should be read as follows. In the first of the tables, emphasizing student intellect is found to be related (-.449) to the power of regents. This means that when one looks at universities in which regents have relatively high power (compared to universities in which they have relatively low power) one tends to find in those universities that they emphasize the student intellect goal less than do universities in which regents have less power. Apparently increasing power of the regents comparatively seems to reduce emphasis on student intellect. So too we find also that places in which regents have a lot of power tend also, compared to other universities, to be places in which the faculty is perceived as having little power to pursue its own career interest and where student political life is downgraded. This is a comparative picture across universities.

When we look at the second table we get an estimate of whether the power of the regents affects the ranking of goals within the university and we observe that it does in some cases, although the number of relationships is smaller than in the case of the comparison across universities. The power of regents means that the students' right to inquire tends to be found in the lower third of the goals at universities and so is the facultys' right to develop in ways that they think they ought to be developing. We find however, that within universities that educating persons to the utmost and keeping costs down pushed up into the top third of goals which is consistent with what we would expect when the power of the regents is high.

Legislators and Goals

In Tables 45 and 46 we find data on the relationship between goals and power structure when we compare places in which the legislators are perceived as having alot of power with those in which the legislators are perceived as having less.

On the whole we observe quite a striking relationship. Legislators do seem to make a difference in the goal structure of universities. We notice immediately the kinds of activities that seem to go by the boards in those schools where the power of legislators is perceived to be high (comparing universities to one another). The more powerful the legislators are, the less does the university concern itself with developing the intellect of the student, affecting him permamently with the great ideas, developing objectivity about himself, training him for a scholarly or research career, disseminating new ideas or preserving the heritage, being selective about students or encouraging graduate work. We observe that academic freedom tends to be a casualty, that the faculty have less opportunity to pursue their own careers and the students' right to inquire becomes abridged. So too, legislators do not seem to be so concerned about preserving the university character or with increasing or preserving its prestige. On their minds are the useful careers of students, helping citizens, keeping costs down, satisfying the area needs, and that the university should accept the mission to educate everyone who qualifies. Legislators also tend to have high power in those places that worry about keeping harmony (perhaps so the legislature will not get upset), in which students are involved in university government and in which there is emphasis on undergraduate instruction. Here too the legislature is important in making sure that a full round of student activities is provided, an activity and a goal which, we may recall, was regarded as anathema at the more prestigious research-oriented institutions.

When we compare the ranking of goals within universities the results are very much the same as can be seen in the second table. Although the support goals receive less emphasis, this squares with our previous impression that, although certain goals are not in evidence compared to other universities, within the university however, persons do not go so far as to jettison those concerns altogether. Whereas emphasizing undergraduate instruction is high at places with powerful legislators in comparison to other universities, within those universities it does not show up as being related to the power of the legislators. This means that it may be in

Table 45

Goals Across and Power Structure Across

Legislators

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.704
Affct Stud Perm	-0.674
Dvlp Stud Objct	-0.628
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholarshp	-0.473
Stud Careers	0.566
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	-0.482
Presrv Heritage	-0.496
Assist Citizns	0.692
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.804
Sat Area Needs	0.602
Keep Costs Down	0.546
Acc Gd Stud Onl	-0.782
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	-0.540
Keep Harmony	0.531
Stud Univ Govrn	0.567
Undrgrad Instr	0.605
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	-0.654
Maxim Opportunty	-0.588
Prov Stud Activ	0.501
Stud Rgt Inquir	-0.560
Position	
Presrv Character	-0.482
Incrs U Prestige	-0.656

Table 46

Goals Within and Power Structure Across Legislators

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.769
Affct Stud Perm	-0.721
Dvlp Stud Objct	-0.750
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Career	0.203
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	-0.495
Presrv Heritage	-0.575
Assist Citizens	0.673
Research	
Applied Research	0.596
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.819
Sat Area Needs	0.480
Keep Costs Down	0.542
Mntn Fav Apprsl	0.739
Acc Gd Stud Onl	-0.900
Management	
Ensur Univ Gls	0.561
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	-0.525
Prov Stud Activ	0.628
Stud Rgt Inquir	-0.512
Position	

the top third, the middle, or the bottom third in a state with a powerful legislature.*

Private Agencies and Federal Government and Goals

We may consider both private agencies and federal government together since the findings for both are very sparse. They are provided in Tables 47 through 50.

---

*It must be born in mind that the results on legislators here are based on replies from state universities.

Table 47

Goals Across and Power Structure Across Private Agencies

Student-Expressive	
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Assist Citizns	-0.470
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.634
Ensur Confidence	0.629
Management	
Motivation	
Position	

Table 48

Goals Within and Power Structure Across Private Agencies

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.493
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Assist Citizens	-0.473
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.567
Management	
Motivation	
Position	

Table 49

Goals Across and Power Structure Across

Federal Government

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.552
Affct Stud Perm	-0.492
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Research	
Adaptation	
Management	
Stud Univ Govrn	0.470
Motivation	
Stud Pol Rights	-0.461
Position	

Table 50

Goals Within and Power Structure Across

Federal Government

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.607
Affct Stud Perm	-0.607
Dvlp Stud Objct	-0.544
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Research	
Applied Research	0.504
Adaptation	
Ensur Confidence	0.787
Management	
Motivation	
Stud Rgt Inquire	-0.475
Position	

As may be seen whether private agencies are perceived as powerful or not affects the goal structure of universities only very slightly. The power of private agencies is negatively associated with the emphasis on assisting citizens and educating any students that qualify and positively only with ensuring the confidence of validating groups. The latter is perhaps just what one would expect.

Although the findings for federal government are slightly more numerous, they too are very sparse. As the power of the Federal Government is perceived to increase, goals involving the student intellect and affecting the student permanently as well as student political rights, are seen to be less important and involving students in university government seems to be more important. Within the university a somewhat similar picture presents itself except that applied research rises to occupy a position in the top third of the goals at such universities, ~~and~~ as does ensuring the confidence of validating groups. On the whole these results support the findings of Orlans* who did not find that federal grants made a large difference in the structure of emphases at universities. It seems that whether the Federal Government is perceived as powerful or not does not affect the kind of goals that a university pursues.

State Government and Goals

The picture for State Government seems to be rather similar to that for legislators. The findings are presented in Tables 51 and 52.

---

*Harold Orlans, *Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education*, Washington D.C., Brookings Institute, 1962.

Table 51

Goals Across and Power Structure Across

State Government

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.695
Stud Character	-0.445
Affct Stud Perm	-0.717
Dvlp Stud Objct	-0.676
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholarship	-0.602
Stud Careers	0.514
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	-0.528
Presrv Heritage	-0.496
Assist Citizns	0.480
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.554
Sat Area Needs	0.506
Keep Costs Down	0.476
Acc Gd Stud Onl	-0.627
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	-0.615
Keep Harmony	0.444
Stud Univ Govrn	0.532
Undrgrad Instr	0.496
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	-0.583
Maxim Opportunty	-0.547
Stud Rgt Inquir	-0.577
Position	
Keep Up to Date	-0.483
Incrs U Prestige	-0.529

Table 52

Goals Within and Power Structure Across

State Government

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.809
Affct Stud Perm	-0.697
Dvlp Stud Objc	-0.825
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Career	0.688
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	-0.497
Presrv Heritage	-0.490
Assist Citizns	0.550
Research	
Applied Research	0.596
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.578
Mntn Fav Apprsl	0.621
Acc Gd Stud Onl	-0.806
Management	
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	-0.524
Position	

As may be seen, among those places in which the state government is perceived as having a great deal of power, one finds that the kinds of goals that are likely to be perceived as in the bottom third among universities are: the student expressive goals, training persons for research, disseminating ideas and preserving the heritage, being selective about the kind of students being permitted in and encouraging graduate work. Casualties are likely to be academic freedom, the opportunities for professors to pursue their careers, and the students' right to inquire. Being concerned about being up to date and the prestige of the university also tend to be downgraded. In contrast, upgraded are providing training so that students will have useful careers, assisting citizens, and the trio that we have found together so often (education of all eligibles, satisfying the local area needs and keeping costs down) and the duo of keeping harmony and providing undergraduate instruction.

Within the university though, the ordering of goals, while somewhat similar where the state government is perceived as powerful, is a little different. The picture is similar in the output goals, but management and motivation goals seem to drop out as well as position goals. This does not mean that they are upgraded or downgraded but simply that they are not found to be related to the power of state government. This means that they are affected when one compares universities so that one can look abroad to the greener grass at a university in which the state government has less power as a place in which, for example, the students right to inquire is emphasized more. But that does not mean that the university that one is at will be one in which the students' right to inquire will be downgraded compared to other goals. It will simply be less compared to other universities. Compared to the situation at the university, it may be rated high or medium or low.

Presidents, Vice-Presidents, and Deans of Graduate Schools

We treat these three power holders together since the findings are almost completely negative with all of them. In the case of the presidents and the vice-presidents the explanation is quite clear on examination of the tables. Both presidents and vice-presidents are rated high at practically all universities. Their power therefore is a constant and is not correlated with the goal variable. This simply means that presidents, and vice-presidents are always perceived as powerful. Therefore one can have many different kinds of goal structures under different presidents or vice-presidents. The results of course do not imply there are no differences in power between presidents. We did not ask correspondents to compare the power of their presidents (or vice-presidents) with that of other presidents.

We do not have such an obvious explanation for the lack of findings for deans of graduate schools and the goal structure of universities. There were only three findings altogether, all of them involving the power of the dean and the internal measure of goals. Where one had powerful deans, there is greater emphasis on doing pure research, and on preserving the character of the university than on other goals. The power of the deans of graduate schools, interestingly enough, was negatively associated with keeping costs down. (Gamma + -.448) Perhaps the things deans of graduate schools are involved in doing cost money, and so such places do not worry so much about keeping costs down. In general, then, the findings suggest that whatever the power of the dean of the graduate school, all kinds of goal structures will be found.

Deans of Liberal Arts

In contrast to the paucity of findings when the relative power of the graduate school dean is examined, we come now to deans whose power is very strongly associated with the goal structure of universities. This seems to be true of both the dean of liberal arts and the deans of professional schools, but we will discuss them separately. The findings for the relationship between the power of the dean of liberal arts and the goal structure of universities is shown in Tables 53 and 54.

Table 53

Goals Across and Power Structure Across Deans of Liberal Arts

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.695
Affct Stud Perm	0.605
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.648
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholarshp	0.621
Direct Service	
Prov Spec Trng	-0.459
Dissemnt Ideas	0.500
Preserv Heritage	0.565
Assist Citizns	-0.532
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.554
Applied Research	-0.498
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.489
Sat Area Needs	-0.487
Keep Costs Down	-0.521
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.524
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.618
Ensur Univ Gls	0.565
Just Rewd Prof	0.624
Undrgrad Instr	-0.473
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.593
Maxim Opportunty	0.634
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.722
Position	
Keep Up to Date	0.563
Maintn Quality	0.641
Incrs U Prestge	0.505
Mntn Quality	0.590

Table 54

Goals Within and Power Structure Across

Deans of Liberal Arts

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.644
Dvlp Stud Obj	0.750
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Careers	-0.821
Direct Service	
Provd Spec Trng	-0.532
Presrv Heritage	0.498
Assist Citizns	-0.692
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.511
Applied Research	-0.692
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.476
Sat Area Needs	-0.610
Keep Costs Down	-0.616
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.738
Acc Gd Stud Only	0.615
Management	
Just Rewd Prof	0.530
Undrgrad Instr	1.000
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.559
Prov Stud Activ	-0.654
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.710
Position	
Maintn Quality	0.618

What are those universities like in which deans of liberal arts are (perceived to be) powerful? Table 53 suggests that they are universities in which student expressive goals are important: The student's intellect is cultivated, the attempt is made to see to it that he is affected permanently by the great ideas of the great minds of history, and an attempt is made to develop student objectivity. Emphasis also is very strong in those universities on training students in scholarship, research and other creative activity. The university is also one in which there is a strong conception of itself as disseminating new ideas and as a place which is concerned with preserving the cultural heritage.

Universities in which the dean of liberal arts is a powerful figure are likely to be exclusive institutions accepting only students of high potential in terms of the specific strength and emphases of the university. They think it important to encourage students to go on into graduate work and to protect the students' right to inquire into political matters that may interest him. To the surprise of the investigators, however, the stronger the dean of liberal arts the less emphasis is there on undergraduate instruction as an important goal of the university.

So far as the faculty is concerned, these are the universities in which there is a feeling that the professor should be rewarded in accord with his contribution to his own field rather than to the university, in which a strong effort is made to protect academic freedom and in which the professor is given maximum opportunity to develop his career in accord with his conception of how it ought to be developed. The "terrible trio" (educate to the utmost all students, satisfy the areas needs, and keeping costs down), which have come up so frequently together, are here again negatively associated with the power of the dean of liberal arts. Finally we note, where deans of liberal arts are powerful, the university is concerned to keep up to date, maintaining quality in all things and increasing or maintaining its prestige

When we turn to the relationship between the power of the dean of liberal arts and goals considered internally (that is, how they rank in reference with one another at a particular university), the picture is not much different although certain goals turn out to have less importance or are less closely related to the power of the dean of liberal arts. These are mainly the position goals -- where we find that keeping up to date, maintaining quality only in those fields that the university feels especially strong in, and increasing or maintaining prestige, do not appear. However, most of the differences between the two tables involve negative goals. Thus, training students for useful careers does not appear at all when we were comparing universities to one another, but it does turn up when an internal comparison is made, but negatively as can be seen, with a gamma of -.821. This means that, although when universities are ranked from high to low on the goal of preparing students for useful careers, we find no relationship with the power of the dean of liberal arts, when this goal is compared to other goals within universities, as the power of the dean of liberal arts increases this goal is not likely to be in the top third. In other words it is positively de-emphasized in those universities in which deans of liberal arts are powerful. The same inference can be drawn about the goal of maintaining the favorable appraisal of validating groups. It did not appear in the comparison across universities but does appear in the internal comparison, and it is strongly negative (gamma = -.738). As is so often the case, academic freedom does not appear in the internal comparisons because it was practically always in the top third.

Deans of Professional Schools

Many are probably not surprised at the goal structure associated with powerful deans of liberal arts. After all deans of liberal arts are supposed to be associated with student ~~excessive~~ Expressive goals and with such goals as protecting academic freedom and other kinds of faculty goals. Some persons regard this person as the symbol of the conception of a liberal education. If nothing else his name would suggest it. They will therefore be rather surprised (as we were) at our findings on the deans of professional schools for there is not a great deal of difference between the kinds of universities in which deans of liberal arts are powerful and deans of professional schools are powerful. The findings are presented in Tables 55 and 56.

Table 55

Goals Across and Power Structure Across Deans of Professional Schools

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.523
Dvlp Stud Obj	0.528
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholarshp	0.516
Direct Service	
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.440
Keep Costs Down	-0.443
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.579
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.572
Ensur Univ Gls	0.571
Just Rewd Prof	0.583
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.509
Maxim Opportunty	0.566
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.552
Position	
Maintn Quality	0.570
Mntn Quality	0.489

Table 56

Goals Within and Power Structure Across

Deans of Professional Schools

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.578
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.611
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Career	-0.637
Direct Service	
Assist Citizns	-0.479
Comm Cult Ldshp	-0.508
Research	
Applied Research	-0.493
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.551
Sat Area Needs	-0.501
Keep Costs Down	-0.596
Acc Gd Stud Only	0.595
Maintn Fav Apprsl	-0.590
Management	
Undrgrad Inst	-1.000
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.480
Prov Stud Activ	-0.598
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.589
Position	
Maintn Quality	-0.580

As can be seen although the student expressive goals are not quite so much in evidence as in the case of deans of liberal arts, they are certainly present. We see an emphasis on student intellect and on developing student objectivity, and the same instrumental goal, namely training students in techniques of scholarship and research. Direct service goals and research goals are absent meaning that they may be found in places with weak deans of professional schools as well as places with strong ones, but the support goals are much the same. Deans of professional schools are as exclusive in wanting only certain students, they encourage graduate work quite as much, want to reward the professor in accord with his contribution to his own field rather than to the university, are certainly as much concerned to protect academic freedom, provide maximum opportunity for the professor to develop and for the student to inquire and examine critically any idea or program that he might get interested in. So too, they are as much concerned with quality as are persons in universities in which deans of liberal arts are considered powerful. Indeed although the number of goals is not the same, there is no goal that is present in schools in which deans of liberal arts are powerful which is de-emphasized in schools in which deans of professional schools are powerful.

The picture is confirmed when we look at the comparison of goals within universities as can be seen in the second table. The student expressive goals came through just as strongly, and preparing students for useful careers is negatively related to the power of the dean, just as it was in the case of deans of liberal arts. To the surprise of some, assisting citizens is negatively related to the power of the dean, as is the emphasis on applied research. Our terrible trio are negatively associated with the power of the dean as is maintaining the favorable appraisal of validating groups.

Looking back over the comparison between the deans of liberal arts and deans of professional schools, our findings certainly do not support those who are worried about a conflict between liberal arts and the professional schools. Quite the contrary, it seems that just as professors feel more comfortable when they have powerful deans of liberal arts, it seems to be true that a very similar kind of goal structure is present in universities with powerful professional school deans. One might speculate that a powerful dean of the professional school increases such attractions as academic freedom and the opportunity for professors to develop precisely because a powerful dean is able to resist the type of influence which groups in the community can bring to bear on a weak dean. The dean of a professional school then is a bulwark of academic freedom to an extent that has perhaps not been sufficiently realized.

Chairmen of Departments

When we turn to an examination of what is associated with the power of chairmen we find a set of goals somewhat like those for deans of liberal arts and deans of professional schools, but there are a number of differences as well. More striking is the resemblance in the goal structure of the situation for chairmen with the situation for faculty as we shall see. To consider the chairmen first, we may examine the data provided in Tables 57 and 58.

Table 57

Goals Across and Power Structure Across

Chairmen

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.603
Devlp Stud Objct	0.585
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.661
Presrv Heritage	0.478
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.568
Adaptation	
Sat Area Needs	-0.488
Keep Costs Down	-0.510
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.497
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.750
Encourg Grad Wk	0.537
Ensur Univ Gls	0.672
Run Univ Demo	0.595
Just Rewd Prof	0.811
Fac Univ Gov	0.507
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.664
Maxim Opportunty	0.753
Stud Pol Rights	0.524
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.714
Position	
Keep Up to Date	0.606
Maintn Quality	0.768
Mntn Bal Quality	0.528
Mntn Quality	0.577

Table 58

Goals Within and Power Structure Across Chairmen of Department

Student-Expressive	
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.596
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholrshp	0.818
Stud Careers	-0.741
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.477
Assist Citizens	-0.518
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.622
Applied Research	-0.483
Adaptation	
Sat Area Needs	-0.660
Keep Costs Down	-0.668
Maintn Fav Apprsl	-0.759
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.509
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.699
Run Univ Demo	0.545
Just Rewd Prof	0.663
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.621
Prov Stud Activ	-0.574
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.683
Position	
Maintn Quality	0.683

What is a university like when chairmen are perceived to be powerful persons? They are places in which a student's* intellect has been cultivated and in which he has been encouraged to develop objectivity about himself and in which both his right to inquire and to advocate political subjects are assured. It is a place which is run democratically and which sees its mission as that of disseminating new ideas whatever those ideas might be and preserving the cultural heritage as well. Pure research is important. At the same time there is little concern with satisfying the needs of the geographic area or with keeping costs down. The university is quite exclusive with reference to whom it lets in, so far as students are concerned. There is strong attention to seeing to it that the will of the faculty prevails in important decisions and that the faculty is directly involved in university government. A strong attempt is made to see to it that professors are rewarded in accord with their contributions to their disciplines rather than to the university, in which academic freedom is protected and the efforts of the professor to advance his career are facilitated. It is a place which tries to keep up to date and to maintain quality of all kinds, as well as a balance. On the whole most professors ought to find this a desirable place in which to work.

When one examines the situation within universities as shown in Table 58, the situation is much the same except that training students in scholarship and creative activities emerges as one of the top goals at such universities and the emphasis on preparing students for useful careers is not found -- quite the reverse. So too there is a de-emphasis on the extension goals or assisting citizens and doing applied research. The terrible trio is present as usual and negatively related to the power of the chairman.

Faculty

The power of the faculty is a subject of obvious interest. To some extent it was the widespread belief on the part of members of the faculty that they have relatively little power that helped to stimulate the study that we are doing. Our interviews indicate and the literature emphasizes the theme that the faculty are little interested in administering the university or even in formulating policy. At least they usually do not wish to take the time that it requires. Administrators often speak of the "working faculty", those members of the faculty who are willing to serve on committees and to assist in policy making activities. In any case it is worth asking what universities are like in which the faculty do have power and whether there is anything distinctive about them.

When we look at the findings as shown in Tables 59 and 60, what is striking is how similar the goal structure is to the picture for chairmen. Most of the same goals are emphasized although there are some new ones. The student-instrumental goal of training persons for scholarship and research turns up here where it did not in places in which chairmen were powerful. The will of the faculty is here but it was in the case of the chairman also. In fact the management goals are identical in the two cases as are the motivation goals and practically all of the position goals.

Perhaps it is not surprising that faculty and chairmen should parallel each other so closely since the chairmen are, after all, and usually do regard themselves as members of the faculty as well. It will be recalled that chairmen as a group are perceived as having No more power than faculty in general. But what our findings suggest is that, whatever the case is generally, those places where faculty do have power are places much like those in which the chairmen are perceived as having power and not very different from those in which deans are. Certainly it is a better place for the faculty when the faculty have power. However our findings suggest that professors would probably attain much the same goals in those universities in which deans have power also.

Students, Parents, Citizens, and Alumni

When we came to examine what kinds of goal structures were associated with the relative power of students, parents, citizens and alumni, we drew almost a total blank. The major reason is that all of these are regarded as having so little power that the power is practically a constant and in that sense is like the power of the president. Consequently we are forced to conclude that those concerned about the power of these groups have little basis for alarm. Given their present state of low power they do not have any impact on the university except on certain scattered goals. For example such little difference as there is in student power is shown to be related to the will of the faculty as a goal and the place of students in university government. The latter is a predictible finding, but the number of findings is so small in number that it could easily be due to chance. The power of the oft-feared alumni was found to be related to the goal that involved assisting students in upward mobility, ensuring the confidence of validating groups and providing student activities as well as producing the well rounded student. These are what one would predict but they are very small in number and hardly amount to much support for those that believe that alumni are evil geniuses operating behind the scenes subverting the goals of the university.

Goals and the Power Structure: Power Considered Internally

We turn our attention next to an analysis of the extent to which different power structures are associated with different kinds of goal structures, but this time, whenever we are talking about power we are always taking about the way in which a given power group or person compares to others at that university. Thus when we talk about the regents and we are comparing places in which the regents have a high amount of power with those in which the regents have a low amount of power, what we mean is not the regents at a given university in comparison with the regents at other universities, but the regents in comparison with legislators,

Table 59

Goals and Power Structure Across Universities Faculty

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.476
Dvlp Stud objct	0.564
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.495
Train Scholrshp	0.528
Stud Careers	-0.544
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.537
Presrv Heritage	0.452
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.589
Adaptation	
Keep Costs Down	-0.526
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.474
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.946
Ensur Univ Gls	0.506
Run Univ Demo	0.821
Just Rewd Prof	0.680
Fac Univ Govrn	0.878
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.803
Maxim Opportunty	0.775
Stud Pol Rights	0.656
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.766
Position	
Keep up to Date	0.446
Maintn Quality	0.594
Maintn Quality	0.456

Table 60

Goals Within and Power Structure Across

Faculty

Student-Expressive	
Well Round Stud	-0.637
Student-Instrumental	
Gv Stud Suc Fac	-0.524
Stud Grad Citizen	-0.644
Stud Careers	-0.703
Direct Service	
Provd Spec Trng	-0.601
Dissemnt Ideas	0.503
Assist Citizens	-0.526
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.595
Applied Research	-0.598
Adaptation	
Sat Area Needs	-0.574
Keep Costs Down	-0.639
Maintn Fav Apprsl	-0.844
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.501
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.965
Run Univ Demo	0.836
Fac Univ Govern	0.833
Keep Harmony	-1.000
Undrgrad Inst	-1.000
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.735
Stud Pol Rights	0.830
Prov Stud Activ	-0.566
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.718
Protct Acd Frdm	1.000
Position	

state government, deans of graduate schools and so forth at that particular university. This therefore is an internal analysis so far as power is concerned. In each case we wish to compare how those places in which regents are ranked high in comparison to other power groups at that university affect the goals of the university when those goals in turn are compared across universities and when the goals are compared to other goals at that particular university. The first is the external analysis of the goals and the second the internal analysis as will be recalled. As before our tables will be presented in pairs with the external analysis first and then the internal analysis next.

Regents

When we compare regents to other potential powerholders at each university and try to relate places where regents have different powers to the goal structure, we obtain no findings at all. The reason is simply that at all 68 universities regents, when compared to other powerholders, were placed in the top third among the powerholders. In other words, power of the regents, internally considered, is a constant and consequently will not be found to be related to goals.

Legislators

The data on the power of legislators, in comparison to other power groups, are presented in Tables 61 and 62.

Table 61

Goals Across and Power Structure Within Legislators

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.693
Affct Stud Perm	-0.604
Dvlp Stud Ojb	-0.618
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholarshp	-0.547
Stud Careers	0.469
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	-0.527
Assist Citizens	0.648
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.767
Sat Area Needs	0.630
Keep Costs Down	0.562
Acc Gd Stud Onl	-0.840
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	-0.622
Keep Harmony	0.480
Stud Univ Govrn	0.582
Undrgrad Instr	0.585
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	-0.620
Maxim Opportunty	-0.624
Prov Stud Activ	0.451
Stud Rgt Inquir	-0.547
Position	
Keep Up to Date	-0.469
Maintn Quality	-0.512
Preserv Charact	-0.487
Incrs U Prestige	-0.649
Mntain Quality	-0.478

Table 62

Goals and Power Structure
Within Universities
Legislators

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.782
Affct Stud Perm	-0.665
Dvlp Stud Objct	-0.708
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Careers	0.673
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	-0.514
Assist Citizens	0.625
Research	
Applied Research	0.540
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.766
Sat Area Needs	0.558
Keep Costs Down	0.623
Mntn Fav Apprsl	0.767
Acc Gd Stud Onl	-0.924
Management	
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	-0.597
Prov Stud Activ	0.614
Position	

It can be seen from tables 61 and 62 that the power of the legislators in comparison to other potential powerholders clearly makes a difference in the goal structure of the university. In those places in which the legislators tend to be ranked high in comparison to other powerholders the university is likely to be a place which, in comparison to other universities, emphasizes preparing students for useful careers, assisting local citizens with their problems, educating all students to the utmost rather than being selective (the latter has a Gamma of -.840) satisfying local area needs, keeping costs down, keeping harmony, being concerned with undergraduate instruction, involving students in the government of the university. Equally impressive are the minus relationships. We find that places in which legislators are powerful are definitely not places in which student intellect is cultivated, in which attempts are made to affect the student permanently, or to develop student objectivity. ~~It is~~ There is an inverse direction to what we have called the "terrible trio" elsewhere. Places in which legislators are strong are also likely to be places which definitely de-emphasize research, encouraging students to get training in research or scholarship, or in disseminating original ideas to the surrounding area. Academic freedom is a casualty as is providing opportunity for the faculty to develop or for the students right to inquire (while student activities are provided for). All of the positional goals suffer -- keeping up to date, maintaining quality, prestige, and preserving the universities character.

When we look at the situation internally as far as legislators are concerned the picture is much the same (academic freedom does not occur as a relationship because, as before, it is in the top third among goals and keeping harmony does not occur because it is in the bottom third). We note however that positional goals vanish altogether. This means that there is ~~not~~ NO relationship within the university compared to other goals so far as the power of the legislators are concerned. Within universities these positional goals may be in the top, middle or bottom third whatever the power of the legislator. The legislators do not have this effect within the university although they do affect them in comparisons across universities.

Private Agencies

The data on private agencies are presented in Tables 63 and 64. Here private agencies are compared as powerholders to other possible powerholders. Private agencies refers to sources of large private grants or endowments.

Table 63

Goals (2) and Power Structure (2)

Private Agencies

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.767
Affct Stud Perm	0.816
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.649
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholrshp	0.641
Stud Career	-0.654
Direct Service	
Assist Citizens	-0.783
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.519
Applied Research	-0.543
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.900
Sat Area Needs	-0.695
Keep Costs Down	-0.571
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.549
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.745
Ensur Conf	0.543
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.692
Keep Harmony	-0.703
Stud Univ Govrn	-0.748
Undrgrad Instr	-0.603
Motivation	
Protect Acd Frdm	0.539
Maxim Opportunty	0.509
Prov Stud Activ	-0.594
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.531
Position	
Incrs U Prestg	0.509

Table 64

Goals (2) and Power Structure (2)

Private Agencies

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.898
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.841
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholrshp	0.743
Stud Careers	-0.625
Direct Service	
Presrv Heritage	0.640
Assist Citizens	-0.695
Comm Cult Ldshp	-0.519
Research	
Applied Research	-0.653
Adaptation	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.666
Educ to Utmost	-0.779
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.598
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.813
Management	
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.603
Prov Stud Activ	-0.652
Position	

The characteristic clustering that we have begun to see manifests itself here as well. We observe the same three student-expressive goals all correlated positively with this source of power (student intellect, affect student permanently, and develop student objectivity) together with training students in scholarship and methods of research. This group of four tends to be found in situations where the terrible trio are found negatively associated with the variable under investigation (educate to utmost, satisfy area needs, keep costs down) and usually along with that of maintaining the favorable appraisal of validating groups. We observe here a negative relationship with ensure the confidence of those that pay the bills which is understandable in places in which private sources of large grants are important. This is a validating measure too.

Where sources of large private grants or endowments are important there is little concern with keeping harmony or involving the student in university government or undergraduate instruction or providing a full round of student activity. On the other hand academic freedom is important as providing a maximim opportunity for the faculty to develop in their own way. On the whole we see a collection ~~of~~ or goal structure which most faculty would find agreeing with their point of view. It should be noted however that the expressive goals are not associated with a liberal education. They are more strictly the narrower classical education involving emphasis on developing the mind.

When we look at the way goals compare to one another within universities as shown in the second table, the picture is essentially the same with, as usual a smaller number of relationships. As before this is partly accounted for by the narrower variation possible within the university as compared to across universities. Thus for example while doing pure research is important at places where sources of large private grants or endowments are perceived as having a lot of say in comparison to other powerholders, within the university pure research is not necessarily in the top third of the goals emphasized at that university. Although applied research is likely to be in the bottom third, the management goals drop out altogether which again does not mean that they are unimportant but simply that they may or may not be emphasized in comparison to others at that institution.

Federal Government

Findings here were almost completely absent. This does not appear to be due to any maldistribution. It simply means that when the Federal government is compared as a powerholder to other potential powerholders the relative position of the Federal government simply does not affect the goal structure of the university.

State Government

Although the Federal government's relative power, compared to other powerholders, did not seem to affect the goal structure of the university the situation is altogether different with the state government (as we found with our earlier analysis of power structure). Here we are not comparing universities to one another, but the state government in comparison say to the power of deans or the power of presidents or other groups. As may be seen in Tables 65 and 66 the picture for state government is much like that for the legislators.

Table 65

Goals (2) and Power Structure (2)

State Government

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.690
Stud Character	-0.535
Affct Stud Perm	-0.677
Dvlp Stud Objct	-0.566
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholarshp	-0.589
Stud Career	0.606
Direct Service	
Assist Citizens	0.524
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.662
Sat Area needs	0.656
Mntn Fav Apprsl	0.510
Acc Gd Stud Onl	-0.733
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	-0.647
Keep Harmony	0.527
Stud Univ Govrn	0.516
Undrgrad Instr	0.543
Motivation	
Protct Acd Fredm	-0.587
Maxim Opportunty	-0.538
Stud Rgt Inquir	-0.530
Position	
Keep Up to Date	-0.492
Presrv Character	-0.498
Incrs U Prestige	-0.624
Mntain Quality	-0.521

Table 66

Goals (2) and Power Structure (2)

State Government

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.810
Stud Character	-0.559
Affct Stud Perm	-0.636
Dvlp Stud Objct	-0.740
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Careers	0.657
Direct Service	
Comm Cult Ldshp	-0.508
Research	
Applied Research	0.588
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.513
Sat Area Needs	0.529
Keep Costs Down	0.526
Mntn Fav Apprsl	0.715
Acc Gd Stud Onl	
Management	
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	-0.549
Prov Stud Activ	0.643

The trio of intellectual goals is negaitvely associated with the power of the state government and in addition student character as a goal is negatively associated as is trained scholarship which tends to be found with these intellectual goals. In contrast the trio of adaptation goals is positively related to the power of the state government. So too, goals such as keeping harmony, and undergraduate instruction become important in places in which the state government is considered important. Going by the boards are keeping up to date, preserving character, prestige, and maintaining quality.

When we look at how goals stack up in comparison to one another, the picture is similar: the same four student expressive goals show up negatively related so that they tend to be in the bottom third. Applied research turns up for the first time in this comparison and is found in the top third typically. The trio of adaptation goals remains in the top third and being selective about students drops to the bottom third.

Presidents and Vice-Presidents

When comparisons were made to determine the impact of the relative power (internally considered) of these officials, we turned up practically no findings. The reason was the same as in our previous analysis: both of these persons tend are rated in the top third of powerholders at all universities. In the case of the presidents they are always in the top third and in the case of the vice-presidents they are in the top third in 64 out of 68 universities.

Deans of Graduate Schools

With deans of graduate schools we obtained only one relationship namely a negative one with student political rights. This result however cannot be attributed to the possibility that the deans of graduate schools were a constant because they were not. Instead, as we found when we examined deans of graduate schools before, the relative power of these deans does not seem to be associated with any distinctive goal structure.

Deans of Liberal Arts

When we examined deans of liberal arts in comparison to other deans as well as other powerholders, we obtain the results shown in Tables 67 and 68.

Table 67

Goals (2) and Power Structure (2)

Deans of Liberal Arts

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.758
Affct Stud Perm	0.716
Dvlp Stud Obj	0.616
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.518
Presrv Heritage	0.613
Assist Citizens	-0.533
Research	
Adaptation	
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.550
Management	
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.547
Stud Pol Rights	0.516
Prov Stud Activ	-0.526
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.640
Position	
Maintn Quality	0.530
Maintn Quality	0.547

Table 68

Goals (2) and Power Structure (2)

Deans of Liberal Arts

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.590
Affct Stud Perm	0.723
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.773
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Career	-0.650
Direct Service	
Presrv Heritage	0.549
Assist Citizens	-0.622
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.514
Sat Area Needs	-0.570
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.642
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.554
Management	
Motivation	
Prov Stud Activ	-0.593
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.646
Protct Acd Frdm	1.000
Position	

We find a configuration which is distinctive. It overlaps somewhat the picture for situations in which private sources of funds are important but not consistently. To begin with we see that the trio of intellectual goals are important as the dean of liberal arts power compared to other deans goes up, and so too is the goal of disseminating ideas and preserving the heritage. Being selective about students and protecting academic freedom and student political rights as well as their right to act become important. So too is quality an important goal. However we do not find any relationship to pure research as a goal, nor is our terrible trio present at all. This means that whether one has powerful deans of liberal arts in comparison to other deans does affect certain of the intellectual goals and motivational and positional goals, but does not affect adaptation goals.

On the other hand when we look at the picture within universities by goals, we get the familiar picture for here the trio of adaptation goals do turn up all negatively related, which means that they tend to be found in the bottom third. This means then that when deans of liberal arts become more powerful than other deans they do not affect the relative emphasis on these adaptation goals as between universities but they certainly affect them within the university in comparison to other goals. The situation is one to cause them to drop into the bottom third.

Deans of Professional Schools

Here we attain a surprising result. It may be recalled that in our discussion of deans of professional schools in the earlier analysis, that powerful deans were associated with much the same kind of goals as found in those universities in which there are powerful deans of liberal arts. This is not at all the case when we compare deans of professional schools not with deans of other universities but with other deans at the university. Here we obtain no findings at all so far as goal structure is concerned. This may be interpreted to mean that when the power of deans of professional schools is high at a university compared to what it is at other universities that the goals are intellectual and much the same as one finds when deans of liberal arts are powerful. On the other hand when the power of deans of professional schools rises above that of other deans or other powerholders at the university, no distinctive power structure can be seen. This means that whether such deans are powerful or not student expressive goals may be emphasized. Or the adaptation goals may be emphasized. There is simply no relationship.

One must be cautious therefore in interpreting our earlier finding that powerful deans of professional schools are associated with much the same values as those in which there are powerful deans of liberal arts. This is only true across universities and is not at all generalizable within universities. That does not mean of course that having powerful deans of professional schools are either undesirable or desirable. One can find given goal structures whatever the power of the deans of professional schools.

Chairmen of Departments

When we examine the relative power of chairmen of departments within universities we obtained practically no significant findings. This occurs because in 65 of the 67 universities chairmen of departments are rated as medium in power (in two they are rated low). Thus this value again is a constant which results in no findings.

Faculty

The findings for faculty are presented in Tables 69 and 70.

Table 69

Goals (1) and Power Structure (2)

Faculty

Student-Expressive	
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.666
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Research	
Adaptation	
Management	
Run Univ Demo	0.834
Fac Univ Govrn	0.935
Will of Faculty	1.000
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.764
Maxim Opportunty	0.868
Stud Pol Rgts	0.868
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.868
Position	
Keep Up to Date	0.709

Table 70

Goals (2) and Power Structure (2)

Faculty

Student-Expressive	
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Good Citizen	0.790
Train Scholarshp	1.000
Direct Service	
Research	
Adaptation	
Sat ARea Needs	-0.727
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.791
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.938
Run Univ Demo	0.912
Undrgrad Instr	-0.952
Fac Univ Govrn	0.917
Motivation	
Maxim Opportunty	0.793
Devlp Pride Univ	-0.701
Stud Pol Rights	0.819
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.682
Position	

CHAPTER 9

COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATORS WITH FACULTY

In this chapter we address ourselves to the question of the nature of the differences between administrators and faculty and how large these differences are with references to some of our key variables. We concern ourselves first with the question of whether the administrators and the faculty differ and how they see the university goals. Throughout our report we have made use of a composite measure of estimating goals. It is therefore very important to know whether there are any critical differences between administrators and faculty as groups. For if there are some clear patterned differences, then a given goal emphasis at a university may reflect the views of the administrators or the views of the faculty and may have been biased.

The second consideration in this chapter is with the question of whether administrators and faculty differ in what they think goals ought to be. Our findings in chapter 7 show that administrators do have more power than the faculty. The question to which we address ourselves here is: does this make a difference? They do have more power but do they use this power in ways contrary to what the faculty would like? One measure is the extent to which their views of the goals of what the university ought to be differ from those of the faculty. We examine this question.

Lastly we consider the question of whether administrators differ from faculty in their background. Does administration tend to attract a different kind of person? We seek to answer this question within the limits of the background data that we were able to secure from our respondents.

Administrators Compared to Faculty in Perceptions of the Goals of the University

In Table 71 we have presented the major findings in this inquiry.

CHAPTER 9

COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATORS WITH FACULTY

In this chapter we address ourselves to the question of the nature of the differences between administrators and faculty and how large these differences are with references to some of our key variables. We concern ourselves first with the question of whether the administrators and the faculty differ and how they see the university goals. Throughout our report we have made use of a composite measure of estimating goals. It is therefore very important to know whether there are any critical differences between administrators and faculty as groups. For if there are some clear patterned differences, then a given goal emphasis at a university may reflect the views of the administrators or the views of the faculty and may have been biased.

The second consideration in this chapter is with the question of whether administrators and faculty differ in what they think goals ought to be. Our findings in chapter 7 show that administrators do have more power than the faculty. The question to which we address ourselves here is: does this make a difference? They do have more power but do they use this power in ways contrary to what the faculty would like? One measure is the extent to which their views of the goals of what the university ought to be differ from those of the faculty. We examine this question.

Lastly we consider the question of whether administrators differ from faculty in their background. Does administration tend to attract a different kind of person? We seek to answer this question within the limits of the background data that we were able to secure from our respondents.

Administrators Compared to Faculty in Perceptions of the Goals of the University

In Table 71 we have presented the major findings in this inquiry.

Table 71

Goals Seen As More Important By Administrators

- Hold Our Staff
- Will of Faculty
- Protect Acd Frdm
- Devlp Fac Lylty
- Stud Intellect
- Stud Character
- Just Rewd Inst
- Stud Pol Rights
- Run Univ Demo
- Stud Good Citizen
- Dvlp Stud Objct
- Stud Rgt Inquir
- Mntain Quality
- Stud Taste
- Dissemnt Ideas
- Maxim Opportunty
- Devlp Pride Uni
- Keep Up to Date
- Affct Stud Perm
- Train Scholrshp
- Presrv Heritage
- Ensur Univ Gls
- Maintn Quality
- Well Round Stud
- Just Rewd Prof
- Fac Univ Govrn

Goals Showing No Appreciable Difference In Perceived Importance

- Encourg Grad Wk
- Educ to Utmost
- Keep Harmony
- Sat Area Needs
- Stud Univ Govrn
- Stud Suc Fac
- Do Pure Research
- Keep Costs Down
- Mntn Bal Qualty
- Acc Gd Stud Onl
- Comm Cult Ldshp
- Undrgrad Instr
- Incrs U Prestige
- Provd Spec Trng
- Presrv Character
- Assist Citizens
- Mntn Fav Apprsl
- Stud Careers
- Applied Research
- Ensur Confidnc
- Prov Stud Activ

to feel the university is doing more to protect academic freedom than the faculty is likely to feel.

As one looks down the list of goals they are for the most part what one would expect. In general it is quite understandable that faculty will be more dissatisfied with attempts to hold staff since it is the faculty that gets hurt. The administration is likely to take the broad view and feel the important thing is the overall strength of the university. Hence the loss of staff in one part may be offset by an addition to staff in another part.

Developing faculty loyalty is not surprising as a perception of the administration in comparison to the faculty and is to some extent the obverse of the "hold our staff" goal. The student intellect and student character goals as well as student objectivity we have seen a number of times as a trio which tend to be that the faculty think are more important. It is not surprising then that the faculty feel less is being done to pursue those goals than does the administration. Similarly the same argument follows with the "maintain quality" goal.

In spite of these differences it must be emphasized that the actual differences are very slight. They correspond to a very low gamma (less than .176). Elsewhere in this report, we have not considered gammas that low to be worth paying attention to. In general we can than infer that our measures of how universities are perceived represent accurately the views of administration and faculty equally well.

Office By Goal

We made a second attempt to see whether administrators and faculty differ in how they see the goals of the university. The results are presented in Table 72.

As may be seen the great majority of goals were perceived as being of the same order of importance by both faculty and administrators. In the case of 34 of the 47 goals we were not able to discover even a very small difference in the way in which these goals are perceived. The goals listed therefore are apparently perceived as being either of great, medium or little importance equally by the faculty or the administrators. Consequently no question of the value of a composite measure comes up with any of these goals.

The 13 goals that did show some difference are listed in the first column. It is essential to point out however that our measure of difference was Goodman and Kruskal's gamma, in which the administrators are considered "higher" than faculty. A minus finding therefore implies that a goal is considered more important by the faculty; a plus finding indicates a goal is considered more important by the administration than the faculty. However only if the gamma was of considerable size are we justified in considering that a difference exists. We took all of our gammas and split the distribution in thirds. The goals that are listed as being considered more important by the faculty are those that were negative and exceeded a gamma of .176. This is a very low gamma. Thus even the goals that were considered more important by the faculty were only considered so to a very small extent. In sum,the overall picture is one of very little difference, but with the 13 goals, such slight difference as is found tends to be in favor of the administrators.

The 13 goals listed in the first column tend to be perceived as somewhat more important by the administration than by the faculty. This does not mean that we are comparing what each group thought ought to be the case. That analysis follows in the next section. Here we are simply comparing what is in fact the case. This means then that on the goal of "hold our staff", administrators are inclined to think that the university is doing more about holding its staff than the faculty is. So too, on "protect academic freedom". Here also the administration is likely

Table 72

Goals Seen As More Important By Higher Ranking Persons

Hold Our Staff
Will of Faculty
Protct Acd Frdm
Stud Intellect
Dissemnt Ideas
Just Rewd Inst
Stud Pol Rights
Run Univ Demo
Stud Good Citizn
Dvlp Stud Objct
Fac Univ Govrn
Stud Rgt Inquir
Mntain Quality

Goals Showing No Appreciable Difference In Perceived Importance

Devlp Fac Lylty
Stud Character
Stud Taste
Maxim Opportunty
Devlp Pride univ
Keep Up to Date
Affct Stud Perm
Train Scholarship
Presrv Heritage
Ensur Univ Gls
Maintn Quality
Acc Gd Stud Onl
Just Rewd Prof

Encourg Grad Wk
Keep Harmony
Stud Univ Govrn
Presrv Charactr
Stud Suc Fac
Do Pure Research
Keep Costs Down
Well Round Stud
Undrgrad Instr
Comm Cult Ldshp
Prov Stud Activ
Incrs U Prestig

Provd Spec Trng
Educ to Utmost
Sat Area Needs
Assist Citizens
Mntn Fav Apprsl
Mntn Bal Quality
Ensur Confidnce
Applied Research
Stud Careers

Here we break the administration down into the individual categories chairmen, deans, vice-presidents, presidents and see whether there is any difference by rank in the importance of goals as perceived. Again we have very small differences none of them exceeding a Gamma of .138. In general then we can infer there is no tendency for perceived goal importance to vary by rank.

Goal Values Related to Office Held

An important question revolved about whether administrators believed that the goals ought to be any different from the way in which faculty believe they ought to be. As we have said repeatedly even though it is clear that administrators do have definitely more power than the faculty, this is not a cause for concern on the part of the faculty or for others who are concerned about academic values provided administrators share the same academic values. We have tried to get at this in two ways by seeing whether goal values vary as one moves up the status ladder from faculty through chairman, dean and so on and secondly by comparing administrators as a group with the faculty. The comparison of lower administrators and faculty with hired administrators is presented in Table 73.

Table 73

Office By Goal Value Measure
Across Universities

Rise With Rank	Fall With Rank
Hold Our Staff	Maximum Opportunty
Mntain Quality	Will of Faculty
Devlp Fac Lylty	
Stud Character	
Devlp Pride Univ	
Affct Stud Perm	
Preserv Heritage	
Sat Area Needs	
Keep Costs Down	
Just Rewd Instr	
Stud Good Citizn	
Ensur Confidnce	
Prov Stud Activ	
Incrs U Prestige	

Of the table of 47 goals only 16 showed any relationship at all to rank. Those that did are listed in the table. Fourteen of the 16 tend to rise with rank. This means that presidents, vice-presidents, and deans as compared for example to chairmen and faculty tend to rate as goals that ought to be given more attention those listed there. As can be seen most of them are, predictively, support goals. It is not then surprising at all that persons responsible for the support activity should believe that they ought to be given more importance. On the other hand we see that near the bottom, that is the faculty and chairmen, there is the feeling that more opportunity should be given to the faculty to pursue what is necessary to advance their careers and that the will of the faculty should prevail in major decisions.

It must be emphasized that the gammas associated with these relationships are all very low indeed practically all of them being of the order of .15 or lower and only one going over point two (maximum opportunity for the faculty). Consequently considering the size of the gammas which we have grown accustomed to in our across classification analysis in previous chapters, we are certainly stretching matters to call these differences worth paying attention to at all. I think the conclusion could be defended that there is no difference in the values of administrators as one moves up the ladder

The comparison of administrators with faculty is made in Table 74.

Table 74

Administrators - Faculty By Goal Value Measure

Across Universities

Administrators Higher

Hold Our Staff
Devlp Fac Lylty
Stud Character
Stud Taste
Devlp Pride Univ
Preserv Heritage
Sat Area Needs
Ensur Univ Gls
Just Rewd Inst
Stud Good Citizn
Ensur Confidnce
Incrs U Prestg
Mntn Quality

Faculty Higher

Will of Faculty
Maxim Opportunty

The findings are practically identical with those in which we compared higher ranking administrators with those further down. Here we see again the differences are very small indeed with gammas even smaller than those obtained in the previous analysis. Such differences exist as again what one would have predicted given the position of administrators and their responsibilities. Again a fair conclusion is that the values of administrators do not differ significantly from the values of faculty.

The Personal Backgrounds of Administrators As Compared To Faculty

An important question as we have suggested is whether administrators tend as a group to be any different from faculty in their background. Quite apart from their values, one might predict that perhaps their values will change in time if their backgrounds are different. We performed the same kind of analysis here as we did for goal values. We first attempted to see whether there was any variation as one moved up the ladder. Then we made a straight comparison of administrators with faculty. The results are presented in Tables 75 and 76.

Table 75

Administrators -- Faculty By Personal Background Variables

Variables Higher for Administrators

- Older
- More likely Lutheran, Congregational or Episcopalian than Catholic or Jewish
- More income from consulting
- More income from writing
- Higher total income
- Higher education
- More likely divorced, separated or widowed

Variables Higher for Faculty

- More females
- More nonwhites
- Father more likely born outside U.S.
- More likely born in urban area
- More likely born outside U.S.
- More likely lived in urban area or abroad as youth
- Received degree more recently

Table 76

Office By Personal Background Variables

Variables Which Rise As Rank Rises

Higher administrators older
Higher administrators more likely to be Lutheran, Congregational or Episcopalian than Catholic or Jewish
Total income
Higher administrators more likely to be divorced, separated or widowed

Variables Which Fall As Rank Rises

Lower administrators more likely to be female
Lower administrators more likely to be non-white
Lower administrators fathers more likely to come from outside the U.S.
Lived as you lower administrators more likely to have lived outside U.S.
Lower administrators more likely to be recent degree recipient

Some differences are evident though none of them are such to suggest that there are any striking differences between administrators either those higher up from those further down or administrators as compared to faculty. When we compare higher ranking with lower ranking administrators we find that higher ranking administrators are older (hardly surprising) that they are more likely to be Lutheran, Congregational or Episcopalian than they are Catholic or Jewish (a situation which probably prevails in a great many organizations suggesting the greater ease of mobility of those protestant denominations than of the Catholic or Jewish groups) and higher in total income. Finding that higher administrators are more likely to be divorced, separated or widowed is almost certainly a reflection of their greater age. At least any other interpretation would surely demand a more intensive study of the private lives of administrators than we have been able to carry out.

In the bottom half of the table we see those variables which tend to be more common among lower ranking persons. Thus such females as are found are likely to be found among lower administrators rather than higher administrators, such negroes, Japanese or Chinese as are found at all will be also not likely found among the higher administrators. Lower administrators are more likely to come from cities, to have been born outside the U.S. and to have lived as a youth outside the U.S. and to have received their degrees more recently.

When administrators are compared directly to faculty we see the results which are recorded in the second table. They are practically identical with those which relate personal background variables to rank. Administrators as compared to faculty are more likely to be older to be Lutheran, Congregational, or Episcopalian, to make more money from consulting or writing as well as total income, to have more education and to be more likely divorced, separated or widowed. The variable of more education is not surprising but may be due to the fact that chairmen are counted as administrators and they include a high proportion of educated men of course. On the other hand, it must be remembered that we are dealing with academic administrators. So too we find that the faculty will have more females, more non-whites, fathers who were born outside the U.S., more likely themselves to have been born outside the U.S., more likely to have lived their youth in an urban area or abroad and more likely to have received their degrees more recently. The latter is again the reflection surely of maturity.

Putting our findings together they certainly do not add up to any impressive evidence for those that claim that administrators are becoming a different breed with a different set of attitudes. By AND large they seem to have very similar backgrounds and such as exist can be attributed to age or maturity. By AND large their attitudes and values seem to be very similar to those of the faculty.

CHAPTER 10

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS AND UNIVERSITY GOALS: A SUMMARY

Although there is general agreement that universities are among the key institutions of our society, there appear to be marked differences of opinion among virtually all segments of the population as to the role and purpose of the university as an institution. To attempt to enumerate and classify all the viewpoints on what a university is, and how it should behave, would be a lengthy time-consuming task. The university as an institution functions through an organization or rather a complex of organizations, which represents something very different from the days of Mark Hopkins and the student at the two ends of the log. Various treatises have tried to describe the role and purpose of the university but remarkably few attempts have been made to systematically study the university, what it is, and how it is administered. This is probably due to the peculiar protective nature of the university organization which allows many people even within the organization itself to hold widely divergent views, and at the same time hold fast to the integrity of the organization itself. The six blind men of Hindustan could easily have been a university president, a vice-president, a dean, two faculty members and an alumni president trying to describe a university.

While it is true that everyone has some perception as to what a university is, its goals and missions, it is obvious that some people's views are more important than others. This is because they have influence and power and, hence, are able to effect change and to set direction and procedure. Power and influence in universities is much more diffuse than in most other organizations and, consequently, it is impossible to draw strict definitions as to the nature of influence and the many forms that it takes. If it is assumed that power and influence accompany organization office, then the most likely groups upon which to focus are the administrators in universities. They are worthy of study as a group of decision makers.

This project was focused on university administrators -- their views concerning the goals of the university -- their perceptions of the relative degrees of influence various groups in the university family have -- their feelings about the workings of the formal and informal organizations of the university -- and finally their own career patterns plus their feeling about their own job.* We will readily admit that this is a major task but it was early decided that one could not gain much understanding of the entire administrative process without studying the sociology of universities in depth.

The methodology we have followed is essentially empirical. When the project was first conceived, the possibility of drawing a selected sample of universities for intensive first-hand observations and analysis was considered. It soon became apparent, however, that very little information existed upon which to base objectively the choice of the sample of universities which could represent universities beyond the schools selected for the sample. In other words, universities are hard to classify. It was then decided that the best approach was to design a mail questionnaire embracing a wide scope of subjects and try to get as much data as possible for analytical and reflective purposes. It is anticipated by the investigators that the questionnaire responses might indicate the possibility of intensive visitation at a few campuses for the purpose of going beyond the questionnaire data.

The selection of universities was made on the basis of the following criteria: 1) the doctor of philosophy or equivalent degree must be offered; 2) graduate degrees including the Ph.D. must be granted in at least three of four major areas of study (humanities, biological sciences, physical sciences, and social sciences);

---

*Some of these subjects, requiring special kinds of multivariate analysis, will be reported on in scholarly journals in the future.

3) doctoral degrees granted in the two least emphasized areas must come to at least ten percent or more of the total degrees conferred; 4) there should be a liberal arts undergraduate school or college and three or more professional schools; 5) the institution must have conferred ten or more Ph.D.'s or other doctoral degrees during the years 1962-1963. These criteria are taken largely from the work of Bernard Berelson* and his study of graduate education in the United States. In general, the reason for these criteria was to select a universe of schools that are individually broad in scope and cover the entire range of graduate, professional and undergraduate education. There are 77 schools which we have included in our study (there are actually two more schools that meet all the criteria, namely, the University of Minnesota and the University of Washington in Seattle, but they are not included becasuse they are the home schools of the principle investigators).

A further note on the selection of schools is in order. Included in the 77 schools were nine schools commonly classed as denominational schools in which it was determined that church organization and direction played a substantial role. While these schools met the criteria, we soon discovered in starting our analysis that there appeared to be such a clustering of answers to some questions so as to distort the findings. Consequently, we decided that we would put these schools aside and treat them as a special case. Further study may reveal that these schools are possibly not as different as we presently believe.

We, therefore, end up with 68 universities as the major basis for our study.

When we made the decision to use the questionnaire method for collecting data, we decided to include all those who in some way were connected with academic administration. We, therefore, sent our questionnaires to presidents, vice-presidents, academic deans and non-academic deans, department heads, and people classified as directors. We also included trustees or regents and we decided also to include a ten percent sample of faculty so as to compare faculty with administrators. Approximately 16,000 questionnaires were sent out and about 7,500 useable replies have been received. By all accepted standards of mailed questionnaire returns, our return must be judged to be gratifying. We used only one postcard follow-up urging non-respondents to reply. Along with the questionnaire, each person received a personally typed letter from the principle investigators outlining the purpose of the study and asking for cooperation. It should also be mentioned that the President of the University of Minnesota at the time, Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, very graciously wrote to his fellow presidents urging them to ask for cooperation among their administrative staff. The questionnaire was long (approximately 300 questions) and required considerable time to complete. At one state, we debated breaking it up into six or seven questionnaires and sending them at separate times. We finally decided to reject that idea, however, for many different reasons.

---

*Bernard Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960

The part of the questionnaire of most concern is the first section which deals with university goals. We were interested in two questions: first, how do administrators and faculty perceive of the goals as they really exist in their institution? We wanted people to consider not merely the statement in the catalog but rather the behavior of the organization itself. In other words, from the viewpoint of the respondent, what is the hierarchy of goals at their university? Second, we are interested in what the respondents think the goals should be, what goals are overemphasized, and which ones are underemphasized. The first question deals with reality as perceived by the respondent. The second question deals with ideals as conceived by the same person. By getting at both the perception and the conception, we thought we might develop a measure which would give a rough index of areas of conflict and possibly give some indication of the degree of the cooperation and stability in the organization.

From an intensive search of the literature, including university catalogs and bulletins, plus the combined ideas of the principle investigators and their colleagues, a list of 47 goal statements was prepared. (Table 77) The respondent was asked to indicate the relative importance of the goal ranging all the way from "of absolutely top importance" to "of no importance" with three steps in between. He was also asked to indicate his evaluation as to how important a goal should be. We assigned weights of from five down to one on each answer. What we wanted was some rank order of priorities which administrators attach to the various goals rather than a black or white answer. It is readily apparent that using this system we can develop a rank order on each individual respondent, if we wish, or we can develop a composite score for each individual school or a further composite score fo all respondents from the 68 universities. Furthermore, we can develop a score for each individual office; *e.g.*, presidents, or for any other measure.

We have used the term "goal" in a rather wide sense to include everything that might be thought of as an aim or objective of an organization. In other words, we have avoided the problem of semantics as far as possible by being all inclusive. Some of the goals might be thought of as output goals commonly called the teaching, research, and service goals. Others might be considered as adaptation goals which have to do with adapting the university to the environment in which it lives. Still others might be known as management goals because they deal with how the place is run. Then there are motivation goals, and lastly the goals of position having to do with increased prestige, etc. There is always going to be some controversy over whether some of these statements are goals or not. Herbert Simon* and others indicate that it is indeed correct to consider goals other than output goals as being of equal significance because the people in the organization perceive of them in that way. Hence, we believe that the goal of protecting academic freedom, for example, or the goal of maintaining the prestige position of the university are just as worthy of study as the goals of research or providing each student with a rich educational experience. Among the many analyses which can be made from the goals data, we started off from the universe approach and are working down to more specific comparisons and analyses. First, then, we have made a ranking on the basis of the raw scores of all respondents (approximately 7,200) on both the "is" and "should" basis. The results of this ranking are found in Table 78.

---

*See Herbert Simon, "On The Concept of Organization Goal," Administrative Science Quarterly, 8: 1-22, 1964.

Mere inspection shows that the number one goal of our respondents is that of protecting academic freedom. They not only believe that this is the goal but they believe even more strongly that it should be. This may be of considerable surprise to many people who have always assumed that administrators did not feel as strongly about academic freedom as did faculty. We have not run a separate analysis of our faculty respondents but we know that of the better than 7,000 respondents, over 5,000 are classed as administrators. One can speculate a great deal about the meaning of this finding but there is no doubt whatsoever that it is an all-pervasive university goal to protect academic freedom. Much as academic persons squabble among themselves as to the meaning of the term, there seems to be little question but that educators in general present a united front to the non-academic world in this matter.

After academic freedom, however, the rankings immediately start to change. Altogether there are 17 goals which are ranked higher on the "should" table than they are on the "is" table. Of these 17, seven are either student expressive or student instrumental goals, four are management goals, three are motivation goals, one is a positional goal and one a direct service goal. We think this finding is most significant because it is a good indication of our respondents' feelings that universities should reorient their goals so as to pay more attention to their job of providing educational opportunities for the students. The student goals that should be up-ranked, according to our respondents, all deal with matters of scholarship and student intellect and not with student activities. Furthermore, it should be noted that all of the student goals were moved into the upper half of the rankings. Some had been there before but others were new to the upper half.

Another upward shift between the "is" and "should" rankings that we think is significant deals with the subject of institutional loyalty and pride. Two goals that moved up in rank were: a) the development of pride in the university and b) the development of faculty loyalty to the institution as well as to the professional field. While this is not completely unexpected, because many times administrators look at faculty criticism as essentially "disloyal", the expression "we don't seem to pull together around here" is often used as implied disloyalty. The up-ranking of the goal on faculty loyalty to the institution probably best expresses administrators' difficulty with faculty mobility. The case of the person attracted away is probably remembered more vividly than is the one that involves attraction to the school. We expect to get into the question of administrator and faculty mobility in the future but we believe that our findings here indicate that administrators and faculty respondents believe that it should be more important to emphasize relatively "localism" rather than "cosmopolitanism" in the Gouldner* sense of the terms. Along this same line, one goal that was ranked sharply upward is the one calling for rewarding persons in accordance with their contributions to the institution. There is evidently a feeling at present that universities do not do this to the extent they should.

---

*Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward An Analysis of Latent Social Roles," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1957-58), 281-306, and 444-480.

Looking at the downward side, it is interesting to note that both research goals, pure and applied research, dropped sharply in ranking. The actual mean scores did not drop (in the case of pure research even went up a little) but the rank dropped significantly. We are interpreting this to indicate the desire for balance. Apparently our respondents feel that the present goal structure is too much weighted in favor of research. As we probe further into our data, especially in separating the various offices of administration, we expect to find some differences. We know that individual universities tend to have different rankings for research. More will be said about that later.

The other important down-ranking has to do with the adaptational goals and the positional goals; such things, for example, as maintaining a favorable appraisal in the eyes of accrediting bodies and other professional associations, or the goal of insuring confidence among those who supply the funds. Administrators who have been active in accrediting know that schools spend a great deal of time in trying to obtain and maintain good standing. Apparently the entire process is resented. Our respondents believe their schools do in fact strive to "keep up with the Joneses" but at the same time, they deplore it and wish it were not so.

One last note on the down-ranking has to do with the goal of providing student activities. In the first place, the goal on the "is" table ranked in 27th place which is in the lower half. On the "should" ranking, it was down to 43rd place -- almost at the bottom. This is especially significant when it is recalled that student goals that dealt with scholarship moved up in the ranking considerably.

The remaining 16 goals remained virtually unchanged in ranking. Many of these are in the lower half of the scale which indicates they are not deemed to be of significant importance in the first place.

Next we turn to the composite score for each individual school on each of the 47 goals. From these scores, we developed two kinds of rank order priority systems.

In one case, we ranked the scores of all 68 universities on a given goal and divided them up into thirds. Thus, a school ranked a goal in the upper, medium, or lower third as judged by the scores of the other schools. We refer to this measure as the "across" measure.

The other system was to compare the school's score on a given goal with the scores on the other 46 goals. In this case, we also divided the array into thirds. This means, for example, that a university ranked a particular goal in the upper medium or lower third of its own internal goal structure. We refer to this measure as the "within" measure. Both measures are valid but for different purposes.

We have made "is" and "should" comparisons using both measures on each of the 47 goals. In order to find out those areas in which there seems to be a high ralationship and those in which there was a very slight relationship, we made the assumption that at a given university if there is a marked difference between the "is" and "should" (between perception and conception), this might indicate tension, conflict and probably extensive mobility. Our findings would seem to support a tentative conclusion that on better than half of the goals, there seems to be a positive relationship between the perception of what "is" and the concept of what "should be". This means, therefore, that when the respondents at a given school ranked a goal so that the composite score placed it in the lower third that their same rankings as to the order on the "should" side also tended to be low.

This is probably an indication that in spite of mobility, administrators and faculty tend to think of their school as a unique place with its own set of goals and priorities. Furthermore, they are reasonably satisfied that the goal structure is appropriate. Whether, in fact, schools are quite as unique as they think they are, it still remains that on a substantial number of goals, they think that the order is about right for their particular school.

Another interesting finding from the "is-should" comparisons is that the relationship is much more clear-cut and covers more goals of the so-called support variety rather than the output goals(teaching, research, and service). The confusion on the output goals may, of course, be due to many things. One likely source is the more or less constant debate going on in American universities about the relative emphasis of teaching. Also, in many schools there is a running debate over the definition of service--what it means and who should render it. Consequently, there are those schools who rank service goals high but not sure they ought to be, and vice versa.

The study continued with an examination of the relationships between university goals and various university characteristics, such as type of control (state, private) prestige, degree of emphasis on graduate work, volume of contract research, size of student body, and location. Some of the relationships are of such magnitude that they must be considered important while others are not. Prestige, for example, turns out to be quite important, as shown below. Size of the university, on the other hand, appears to be much less significant. A careful analysis of each of these university characteristics is needed before any conclusions can be reached. Results thus far give us confidence that an analysis of organizations in terms of their goals can be highly revealing. Very likely the same methodology would be useful in studying organizations other than universities. Business organizations, for example of almost any size and complexity should provide worthwhile subjects. A comparative study of profit and non-profit organizations through the study of goals would make a real contribution to the management literature.

Our findings on the global variables are too numerous to list in this summary. We will illustrate for the cases of type of control and prestige.

In Table 79 the goal of protecting academic freedom is examined to see whether it receives any greater emphasis in state universities as compared to private universities. As can be seen, of the 23 universities which fall in the lower end of the distribution on this particular goal, 20 are state universities. On the other hand of the 23 that fall at the higher end of the distribution on this particular goal, 14 are private universities. It can be seen readily, therefore, that this goal is emphasized more in private universities than in state universities. The size of the relationship is shown by the gamma below to be .627, indicative of a strong relationship.

Next we may turn to Table 80, entitled, "Goals Related to Global Measures", where all of the goals are compared across state and private universities. As can be seen in Table 80 there are distinct differences in the goal structure of private as compared to state universities. Listed here are only those results which surpassed the 5 percent level of significance. Even by such a realtively tight measure, a large number of goals turn out to be significant, 24 out of some 47 tested, clearly far beyond what chance would lead one to expect. In private universities the goals emphasized revolve about student expressive matters such as the student intellect, affecting the student permanently with the great ideas, and helping the student to develop objectivity about himself (no expressive goals distinguish the state universities at all), training the student in methods of scholarship and creative research, serving as a center for the dissemination of ideas for the surrounding area, and encouraging graduate work. In contrast, state universities emphasized to a distinctly greater extent than the private universities preparing the student for useful careers, assisting citizens through extension and doing applied research. Academic freedom, although it is high everywhere turns out to be particularly high in the private universities reflecting their ability to maintain a greater degree of autonomy. Note that we are not speaking of how persons would like things to be but how they perceive that things actually are.

There is also emphasis on the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea of program that they might get interested in, in contrast to state universities where the emphasis is on involving students in the government of the university and providing a full round of student activities. One sees here a greater degree of responsiveness to students in a direct sense.

The private universities emphasize the needs of the faculty in the form of emphasis on making the university into a place in which faculty have maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a matter satisfactory to them by their own criteria, and it should be noticed too that the private universities emphasize the positional goals of keeping up to date, preserving the distinctive character of the university, and increasing or maintaining their prestige.

One of the striking differences is the extent to which the goal of accepting good students only is emphasized in private universities and by contrast the goal of educating to their utmost whomever can get in the state universities. This illustrates the traditional elitist goal of the private university in contrast to the land-grant, service goals of the state university and forms also a validation for the study. We may notice also that it is in the state university that there is emphasis on satisfying the needs of the local area and keeping costs down as well as keeping harmony within the university.

Table 81 illustrates the "within" analysis as Table 80 illustrated the "across". Here we see a very similar picture to that presented by the across analysis but it is introduced here to show what the within analysis might not have revealed. It may be noted for example that "protect academic freedom" does not appear in Table 81. This is not to say that it is not of the importance that we indicated earlier and that made it show up in Table 80. It is rather that academic freedom is a top goal, so much so that it is among the top third of the goals emphasized at all universities when one compares the goals of the universities to one another at a particular university. In other words it is a constant within a university. It is only a variable when universities are compared to each other as was done in Table 80 Similarly it may be noticed that the management goals disappear. This reflects the fact that At all universities, these tended to be among the lower third, or in some cases no differences at all showed up as between state and private. In effect this may be interpreted as meaning that, although private universities may be distinguished from state universities when goals are compared across the board from one university to another, within universities such as management goal as "keeping harmony" is never among the top goals. Instead it is kept where it belongs, (in our respondents' views), namely among the bottom third and, therefore, is a constant in the "within" comparisons. Similarly, relative emphasis on encouraging graduate work as compared to undergraduate instruction only shows up across universities where we have forced a comparison. Within universities neither is permitted to regularly outweigh the other but a better balance is maintained. As may be seen from both Table 80 and 81 state and private universities do differ from one another in the type of goals that are emphasized and the claim of some students of the university that the differences between private and state universities are gradually disappearing as both respond to public needs and federal research, grants, is not supported. Other data which are described in the major body of our report bear out this conclusion in a large number of ways.

The data on comparing universities of different degrees of prestige are presented in Table 82 below for the comparisons across universities. As can be seen in Table 82 the more prestigious universities differ from those less prestigious in a number of distinct ways, some but by no means all of which reflect the distinction between private and state. In general it can be said that the more prestigious the university, the more does it emphasize the student intellect, affecting the student permanently with the great ideas of history, AND developing student objectivity.

By contrast the more prestigious universities positively de-emphasize student taste, and worrying about student careers (that is, preparing the student for useful careers). They are concerned with serving as a center for the dissemination of ideas and preserving the cultural heritage and have little concern with assisting citizens to solve their problems. In fact the negative gamma shows that it is only the less prestigious universities that emphasize assisting citizens. Pure research comes through very stronly as does the elitist goal of accepting only good students. Research goals are very important in the more prestigious universities as can be clearly seen in the very large gammas that show up, plus encouraging graduate work. The more prestigious universities see to it that professor is well taken care of as may be seen from the high gammas dealing with goals that have to do with rewarding the professor in accord with his contribution to his own field, protecting academic freedom, and presenting maximum opportunities for the professor to develop. The students' right to inquire is protected to a greater extent in the more prestigious universities, perhaps reflecting a greater autonomy because they do emphasize academic freedom more. It may be said that the more prestigious places worry about keeping up to date and most interestingly it is the most prestigious places that worry most about their quality and about hanging on to the prestige that they have. These are apparently not things that just happen. By contrast the least prestigious universities find themselves worrying about satisfying the local area needs, keeping costs down, maintaining the favorable appraisal of accrediting organizations, and emphasizing undergraduate instruction. The more prestigious places are those apparently that worry about the care and feeding of professors, about research and about their own prestige. The less prestigious places worry about useful careers for their students and making good consumers of them, helping the local citizens, about cost, and about undergraduate instruction. As we pointed out above, we see again that it is not simply at universities generally that students do not receive a great deal of attention, but that the most prestigious places of all emphasize undergraduate instruction the least of all. Instead, they are concerned with the student's intellect and with the traditional goals of a liberal education to a greater extent than is the case in the less prestigious universities.

We were interested in the power structure of universities and examined this in a variety of ways. In Table 83 we reproduce a portion of one of the tables presented in the text, namely the composite picture for all universities. Few would be surprised to find the president at the top. He is after all the chief executive of the university and is perceived apparently by persons on the average as having the most say about making the bid decisions. The regents being in second place is somewhat more surprising since this did not accord with the information we had on their perceptions of their own power. On the other hand, it may be that power holders in general, in universities as elsewhere, tend to see themselves differently from the way others see them. From their position they do not see themselves as having a great deal of influence one way or another. We note that deans of professional schools are in a prominent position, considerably above the dean of liberal arts, thus providing some support for those that fear that the deans of professional schools are becoming more and more powerful. We do not of course have longitudinal data and we do not know if this is any different than the situation was 25 years ago but they are certainly not perceived as being a powerless group. It must be borne in mind that our estimates include those not only of faculty but also the administrators.

Looking at the other end of the scale we see that those that have a Machiavellian view of the university in that they see certain groups in the community such as citizens, or alarmed parents, or alumni, or large private donors as pulling the strings, do not receive much support at least in the views of those in the university. The faculty can be seen having a middling position but a little bit towards the top. On the other hand it may be noted that they are perceived as having more power as a group than do the chairmen as a group.

We made a number of analyses of the relationship between power and the goals of the university as well as global measures which were discussed in the text. We shall refer to one set of such measures below.

One of the subjects of interest in the study was the extent to which administrators and faculty differed in their conceptions of what the goals the university ought to be. Our findings suggest that there is a striking consensus on the part of administrators and faculty on what the goals are and on what they should be. By and large the split which many people have become alarmed about and which to some extent was one of the reasons for our beginning this study, does not find support from our data. The faculty and administrators tend to see eye to eye. This result held when we make both gross comparisons of the faculty as a group with all administrators as a group and when we broke this down more finely and related the rank of the administrator to the point of view. That is higher administrators tend to agree with the faculty quite as much as do lower administrators or chairmen. In sum, the findings show that although it is true that administrators in general have more power to affect the big decisions than do members of the faculty, they apparently see eye to eye with the faculty and consequently one might infer will use this greater power to further the goals of the faculty since they seem to share the same conceptions as the faculty about what the goals ought to be.

However, this is only an inference and the final type of analysis to which we turn was one in which we related the goals of universities to the power structure. The question is: whatever the administrators said about the university and what it ought to be, how in fact do they behave when they get the power? For example, what are universities like in which, say, deans of professional schools have alot of power as compared to those in which the faculty do? If they are different then we may say that, whatever the professional school deans may say, one does not find the same kind of goal structure where they have power and consequently they do in fact act differently.

The major results of this analysis are presented in the series of Tables 84 through 89.

Table 84 shows the goal structure of universities in relation to the power of the faculty. The plus gammas indicate what universities are like in which the faculty are perceived as having a relatively high power and the minus gammas those in which the faculty is perceived as having lower power. As can be seen a distinctive goal structure emerges, related to some extent to what we found earlier when we examined prestige and type of control.* As can be seen in Table 84 where the faculty has power, there the intellect of the student is emphasized and the importance of the student's developing objectivity about himself is also emphasized. Students are to be trained in methods of scholarship, whereas student taste and student careers are to be de-emphasized. Direct service consists essentially of serving as a center for ideas, and preserving the cultural heritage, and not the land grant goals. Pure rather than applied research is emphasized, and further, when the faculty has power, they tend to be elitist in tryirg to select students. As could be expected, the will of the faculty is one of the important goals and strong effort is made to see to it that the university is run democratically and that professors themselves have a good deal to say about running the university. Again, predictably, academic freedom is a major goal and the rights of students to inquire and even advocate whatever they think important is emphasized. The professors are concerned with making sure that the institution is up to date and that high quality is maintained. They are not concerned with keeping costs down. This finding is not quite so obvious as appears at first glance because we are not talking here about the professors' opinions about what ought to be done but rather about what happens at universities in which faculty are perceived as having a high amount of power compared to the way in which they are perceived at other universities. Universities in which professors are so perceived, we are saying, are universities in which there is little concern with the university goal of keeping costs down.

---

*When we related these variables to one another, only a modest relationship was shown.

When we look next at Table 85 in which the power of the chairmen in relation to university goals is examined, what comes through very strongly is that practically the same set of goals is found with certain changes, though none of them are really very large. Student instrumental goals tend to vanish although it may be noticed two of them were negative for the faculty so that all this shows is that the goals of student taste and student careers which were not emphasized when the faculty have power are neither emphasized nor de-emphasized in places where the chairmen had power. Other goals, however, as may be seen tend to be remarkably similar. This general finding holds up when one examines the Tables 86 and 87 where one has the deans of liberal arts and the deans of professional schools as well. Although in the case of the deans of professional schools, one begins to get a smaller number of goals, nevertheless, there still is a rather remarkable similarity and one finds very few reversals, that is situations where a goal is positive for one powerholder and negative for another. For example places where deans of professional schools are powerful, are places which tend to select only good students and the same thing is true of places where deans of liberal arts are powerful and where chairmen are powerful and where the faculty is powerful. So is the case with emphasis on graduate work, protecting academic freedom, maximum opportunity for the professor and so forth. The number of relationships is not as high but in general reverals do not to occur.

It is when we turn to the relationship between legislatures and university goals, and state government and university goals, that a real difference occurs and here we get almost a complete reversal from the structure that tends to obtain when faculty and deans have power. Thus for example when the faculty have power the goal of student intellect receives strong emphasis. When legislatures have power, it is positively de-emphasized with a very high gamma as can be seen. "Develop student objectivity" similarly is reversed when one look at places where faculty have power. Such is also the case for training scholarship and research, student careers, disseminating ideas, preserving the heritage, accepting good students only, keeping costs down, maximum opportunity for the professors, student right to inquire, and, perhaps most disturbing, protecting academic freedom. For all of these goals there is a complete reversal of their relationship when legislatures have power as compared to the situation when faculty have power. The situation is similar where state governments are perceived as having power.

What these findings seem to add up to is that, in view of the consistency between the views and values of faculty as compared to administrators that we pointed to earlier, we now have the further result that the kind of university one has when the administrators have power is not very much different from that one has when the faculty has power (comparatively speaking, of course). What does make a difference is when legislatures and state government are perceived as having power compared to other universities where they are perceived as having less. It is in these universities that the goal structure really changes. In sum, the faculty and administrators find themselves in agreement, and with the kind of goal structure that both of them seem to find comfortable, at least it is the same goal structure whether one is talking about whether administrators or faculty are powerful. The split is between the university and outside influences particularly the state legislature and state government. Note too that these are local influences. We did not secure findings for the influence of federal government or for sources of endowment funds. On the whole these results support the general picture that was suggested by our finding that academic freedom was the most important of all the goals of American universities. This suggests the importance to them of autonomy in doing their job as they see it. When, however, that autonomy is severely breached as it is apparently when state government or legislators begin to play a significant role in the power structure of a university, then the goals of the university change in a profound way and it becomes something very different.

What, finally, of the effect of the most powerful man of all, namely the president? Here our findings are paradoxical and not what many would have predicted. For we found that when we made comparisons between those universities in which the president was perceived as very powerful as compared to those in which he was perceived as less powerful that there were almost no findings at all, that is no differences in the goal structure of such universities. At first this might have suggested that the power of the president did not make a difference in the goal structure of the university, a conclusion we found hard to accept, precisely because he was considered to be the leading powerholder. Why should the power of persons perceived as having less power such as deans of professional schools or the faculty, make a difference when the differences in the power of the president do not? This result appears to be in a statistical artifact, but an interesting one. It says something about the power of presidents. When we arrange the average score that presidents receive the lowest score was 4.28 and the highest was 4.92. This means that the presidents, alone of all powerholders, occupy the unique position that everywhere they were perceived as having very high power, well over 4.00 on a five point scale. When we split the distribution into thirds even this was not sufficient to produce any variation. This means that there simply was little variation between a person whose average score was 4.28 and a person whose average score was higher than that. They were all crowded over to the right end of the scale. Consequently our finding that the variations in the power of the president do not make any difference in the structure of university goals is simply a way of saying all presidents ~~conceived~~ are so powerful that even when one divides the presidents into the *very very* powerful as distinguished from the *very* powerful no meaningful differences in goal structure emerge because even the least powerful are very powerful indeed. In order, therefore, to examine the effect of differences in the power of presidents it is apparently necessary to move to a different kind of organization than the university as we have defined it. The president we have in the universities that we have studied is apparently so much a part of the structure of such universities ~~and~~ that his impact cannot be detected in the general goal structure that universities share with one another.

Table 77

Academic Goals Classified As To Type

A. Student Expressive

Label		Goal
STUD INTELLECT	1.	Produce a student who, whatever else may be done to him, has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum.
WELL ROUND STUD	2.	Produce a well-rounded student, that is one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual and esthetic potentialities have all been cultivated.
AFFCT STUD PERM	3.	Make sure the student is permanently affected (in mind and spirit) by the great ideas of the great minds of history.
DVLP STUD OBJCT	4.	Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically.
STUD CHARACTER	5.	Develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices.
		B. Student-Instrumental
STUD CAREERS	6.	Prepare students specifically for useful careers.
GV STUD SUC FAC	7.	Provide the student with skills, attitudes, contacts, and experiences which maximize the likelihood of his occupying a high status in life and a position of leadership in society.
TRAIN SCHOLRSHP	8.	Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor.
STUD TASTE	9.	Make a good consumer of the student - a person who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and can make good consumer choices.
STUD GOOD CITZN	10.	Produce a student who is able to perform his citizenship responsibilities effectively.
		C. Direct Service
PROVD SPEC TRNG	11.	Provide special training for part-time adult students, through extension courses, special short courses, correspondence courses, etc.
ASSIST CITIZNS	12.	Assist Citizens directly through extension programs, advice consultation, and the provision of useful or needed facilities and services other than through teaching.
COMM CULT LDSHP	13.	Provide cultural leadership for the community through university-sponsored programs in the arts, public leatures by distinguished persons, athletic events, and other performances, displays or celebrations which present the best of culture, popular or not.
DISSEMNT IDEAS	14.	Serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas that will change the society, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts, or politics.
PRESRV HERITAGE	15.	Serve as a center for the preservation of the cultural heritage.

Table 77 (contd)

D. Research

DO PURE RESEARCH	16.	Carry on pure research.
APPLIED RESEARCH	17.	Carry on applied research.

E. Adaptation Goals

ENSUR CONFIDNCE	18.	Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially (other than students and recipients of services) to the finances and other material resource needs of the university.
MNTN FAV APPRSL	19.	Ensure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs we offer (validating groups include accrediting bodies, professional societies, scholarly peers at other universities and respected persons in intellectual or artistic circles).
EDUC TO UTMOST	20.	Educate to his utmost capacities every high school graduate who meets basic legal requirements for admission.
ACC GD STUD ONL	21.	Accomodate only students of high potential in terms of the specific strengths and emphasis of the university.
SAT AREA NEEDS	22.	Orient ourselves to the satisfaction of the special needs and problems of the immediate geographical region
KEEP COSTS DOWN	23.	Keep costs down as low as possible through more efficient utilization of time, and space, reduction of course duplication, etc.
HOLD OUR STAFF	24.	Hold our staff in the face of inducements offered by other universities.

F. Management Goals

JUST REWD PROF	25.	Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, prerequisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to his own profession or discipline.
FAC UNIV GOVRN	26.	Involve faculty in the government of the university.
STUD UNIV GOVRN	27.	Involve students in the government of the university.
RUN UNIV DEMO	28.	Make sure the university is run democratically insofar as that is feasible.
KEEP HARMONY	29.	Keep harmony between departments or divisions of the university when such departments or divisions do not see eye to eye on important matters.
JUST REWD INST	30.	Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, prerequisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to the functioning of this university.
WILL OF FACULTY	31.	Make sure that on all important issues (not only curriculum), the will of the full-time faculty shall prevail.
UNDERGRAD INSTR	32.	Emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program.
ENCOURG GRAD	33.	Encourage students to go into graduate work.
ENSUR UNIV GLS	34.	Make sure that the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible.

Table 77 (contd)

G. Motivation Goals

PROTCT ACD FRDM	35.	Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.
MAXIM OPPORTUNTY	36.	Make this a place in which faculty have maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a manner satisfactory to them by their own criteria.
PROV STUD ACTIV	37.	Provide a full round of student activities.
STUD RGT INQUIR	38.	Protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in.
STUD POL RIGHTS	39.	Protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind, and any attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals.
DEVLP FAC LYLTY	40.	Develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the university, rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns.
DEVLP PRIDE UNIV	41.	Develop greater pride on the part of the faculty, staff and students in their university and the things it stands for.

H. Positional Goals

MAINTN QUALITY	42.	Maintain top quality in all programs we engage in.
MNTAIN QUALITY	43.	Maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards).
MNTN BAL QUALITY	44.	Maintain a balanced level of quality across the whole range of programs we engage in.
KEEP UP TO DATE	45.	Keep up to date and responsive.
INCRS U PRESTIGE	46.	In-rease the prestige of the university or, if you believe it is already extremely high, ensure maintenance of that prestige.
PRESRV CHARACTR	47.	Keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphasis and point of view, its "character".

Table 78

The Goals of American Universities

Mean	"Is"	Goal	"Should"	Mean
3.90	1	PROTCT ACD FRDM	1	4.33
3.76	2	INCRS U PRESTGE	11	3.80
3.69	3	MNTAIN QUALITY	7	3.99
3.66	4	ENSUR CONFIDNCE	26	3.52
3.57	5	KEEP UP TO DATE	6	4.09
3.56	6	TRAIN SCHOLRSHP	2	4.17
3.55	7	DO PURE RESEARCH	16	3.76
3.49	8	MAINTN QUALITY	4	4.14
3.43	9	MNTN FAV APPRSL	34	3.31
3.42	10	ENSUR UNIV GOALS	9	3.99
3.39	11	DISSEMNT IDEAS	5	4.10
3.39	12	APPLIED RESEARCH	30	3.37
3.39	13	STUD CAREERS	32	3.34
3.38	14	STUD INTELLECT	3	4.17
3.37	15	HOLD OUR STAFF	18	3.74
3.33	16	COMM CULT LDSHP	28	3.49
3.31	17	STUD RGT INQUIR	10	3.88
3.30	18	ENCOURG GRAD WK	27	3.51
3.28	19	PRESRV HERITAGE	20	3.63
3.27	20	STUD GOOD CITZN	14	3.76
3.25	21	WELL ROUND STUD	17	3.75
3.22	22	MAXIM OPPRTUNTY	25	3.55
3.22	23	DVLP STUD OBJCT	8	3.99
3.22	24	KEEP COSTS DOWN	35	3.30
3.21	25	FAC UNIV GOVRN	19	3.63
3.20	26	JUST REWD PROF	21	3.63
3.19	27	PROV STUD ACTIV	43	2.99
3.18	28	GV STUD SUC FAC	33	3.31
3.16	29	RUN UNIV DEMO	22	3.61
3.16	30	AFFCT STUD PERM	15	3.76
3.10	31	ASSIST CITIZNS	36	3.22
3.10	32	JUST REWD INST	13	3.77
3.09	33	DEVLP PRIDE UNIV	23	3.59
3.07	34	SAT AREA NEEDS	42	3.00
3.07	35	MNTN BAL QUALTY	31	3.36
3.01	36	WILL OF FACULTY	24	3.56
3.00	37	PROVD SPEC TRNG	38	3.18
2.95	38	STUD CHARACTER	12	3.79
2.93	39	EDUC TO UTMOST	37	3.19
2.89	40	ACC GD STUD ONL	39	3.09
2.88	41	STUD POL RIGHTS	40	3.08
2.86	42	DEVLP FAC LYLTY	29	3.47
2.84	43	KEEP HARMONY	41	3.06
2.66	44	UNDRGRAD INSTR	44	2.89
2.60	45	STUD UNIV GOVRN	46	2.69
2.56	46	PRESRV CHARACTR	47	2.13
2.47	47	STUD TASTE	45	2.78

Table 79

Illustrative Table Showing Relationship Between Degree of Emphasis On Academic Freedom and Type of Control

	Type of Control		
	State	Private	Total
Low	20	3	23
Medium	13	9	22
High	9	14	23
Total	42	26	68

Gamma* = .627

---

*See Goodman, L. A. and Kruskal, W. H., 1954. "Measures of Associations for Cross-Classifications. Journal of American Statistical Association, 49:732-764. This is a measure, designed for ordinal variables, which has the advantage of being interpretable in a manner analogous to a percentage. Thus a gamma of .800 in one relationship is twice as strong as a gamma of .400.

Table 80

Goals Related to Global Measures

Type of Control

Private	Size of Relationship (gamma)	Across Universities	State	Size of Relationship (Gamma)
		Student-Expressive		
Stud Intellect	(.788)			
Affct Stud Perm	(.784)			
Devlp Stud Objct	(.741)			
Train Scholarshp	(.500)	Student-Instrumental	Stud Careers	(.603)
Dissem Ideas	(.531)	Direct Service	Assist Citizens	(.837)
		Research	Applied Research	(.552)
Acc Gd Stud Onl	(.874)	Adaptation	Educ to Utmost	(.941)
Ensur Confidnce	(.548)		Sat Area Needs	(.718)
			Keep Costs Down	(.626)
Encourge Grad Wk	(.602)	Management	Keep Harmony	(.688)
			Stud Univ Gvt	(.801)
			Undergrad Instr	(.599)
Prtct Acd Frdm	(.627)	Motivation	Prov Stud Activ	(.602)
Maxim Opportunty	(.535)			
Stud Rgt Inquir	(.566)			
Keep Up to Date	(.552)	Positional		
Presrv Character	(.573)			
Instrs Prestige	(.647)			

Table 81

Goals Related to Global Measures

Type of Control

Private	Size of Relationship (Gamma)	Within Universities	State	Size Relationship (Gamma)
		Student-Expressive		
Stud Intellect	(.862)			
Affct Stud Perm	(.848)			
Dvlp Stud Objct	(.931)			
		Student-Instrumental		
Gv Stud Suc Fac	(.563		Stud Careers	(.673)
			Comm Cult Ldshp	(.569)
		Direct Service		
Dissemnt Ideas	(.535		Assist Citizns	(.767)
		Research		
			Applied Research	(.705)
		Adaptation		
Acc Gd Stud Onl	(.888)		Hold Our Staff	(.593)
			Mntn Fav Apprsl	(.680)
			Educ to Utmost	(.844)
			Sat Area Needs	(.533)
			Keep Costs Down	(.562)
		Management		
		Motivation		
Maxim Opportunty	(.604)		Prov Stud Activ	(.638)
		Position		

Table 82

Prestige and University Goals: Across Universities

Student-Expressive	Gamma
Stud Intellect	0.516
Affct Stud Perm	0.473
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.703
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.553
Train Scholarshp	0.730
Stud Careers	-0.504
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.799
Presrv Heritage	0.651
Assist Citizens	-0.455
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.891
Adaptation	
Sat Area Needs	-0.628
Keep Costs Down	-0.448
Mntn Fav Apprsl	-0.583
Acc Gd Stud Only	0.556
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.709
Just Rewd Prof	0.772
Undrgrad Instr	-0.697
Motivation	
Prtct Acd Frdm	0.496
Maxim Opportunty	0.657
Incrs U Prestg	0.691
Mntain Quality	0.756

Table 83

Who Make The Big Decisions

Rank Order

	Average Score
President	4.65
Regents	4.37
Vice President	4.12
Deans of Profess Schools	3.62
Dean of Grad Sch	3.59
Dean of Liberal Arts	3.56
Faculty	3.31
Chairmen	3.19
Legislators	2.94
Federal Govt	2.79
State Govt	2.72
Large Private Donors	2.69
Alumni	2.61
Students	2.37
Citizens of State	2.08
Parents	1.91

Table 84

Goals and Power Structure

Faculty

Student-Expressive	Gamma
Stud Intellect	0.476
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.564
Student-Instrumental	
Stud Taste	-0.495
Train Scholrshp	0.528
Stud Careers	-0.544
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.537
Presrv Heritage	0.452
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.589
Adaptation	
Keep Costs Down	-0.526
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.474
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.946
Ensur Univ Gls	0.506
Run Univ Demo	0.821
Just Rewd Prof	0.680
Fac Univ Govrn	0.878
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.803
Maxim Opportunty	0.775
Stud Pol Rights	0.656
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.766
Position	
Keep Up to Date	0.446
Maintn Quality	0.594
Mntain Quality	0.456

Table 85

Goals and Power Structure

Chairmen

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.603
Devlp Stud Objct	0.585
Student-Instrumental	
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	0.661
Preserv Heritage	0.478
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.568
Adaptation	
Sat Area Needs	-0.488
Keep Costs Down	-0.510
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.497
Management	
Will of Faculty	0.750
Encourg Grad Wk	0.537
Ensur Univ Gls	0.672
Run Univ Demo	0.595
Just Rewd Prof	0.811
Fac Univ Gov	0.507
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.664
Maxim Opportunty	0.753
Stud Pol Rights	0.524
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.714
Position	
Keep up to Date	0.606
Maintn Quality	0.768
Mntain Quality	0.577

Table 86

Goals and Power Structure

Deans of Liberal Arts

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.695
Affct Stud Perm	0.605
Dvlp Stud Objct	0.648
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholrshp	0.621
Direct Service	
Prov Spec Trng	-0.459
Dissemnt Ideas	0.500
Preserv Heritage	0.565
Assist Citizens	-0.532
Research	
Do Pure Research	0.554
Applied Research	-0.498
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.489
Sat Area Needs	-0.487
Keep Costs Down	-0.521
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.524
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.618
Ensur Univ Gls	0.565
Just Rewd Prof	0.624
Undrgrad Instr	-0.473
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.593
Maxim Opportunity	0.634
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.722
Position	
Keep Up to Date	0.563
Maintain Quality	0.641
Incrs U Prestg	0.505
Mntn Quality	0.590

Table 87

Goals and Power Structure

Deans of Professional Schools

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	0.523
Dvlp Stud Obj	0.528
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholarshp	0.516
Direct Service	
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	-0.440
Keep Costs Down	-0.443
Acc Gd Stud Onl	0.579
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	0.572
Ensur Univ Gls	0.571
Just Rewd Prof	0.583
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	0.509
Maxim Opportunty	0.566
Stud Rgt Inquir	0.552
Position	
Maintn Quality	0.570
Mntn Quality	0.489

Table 88

Goals and Power Structure

Legislators

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.704
Affct Stud Perm	-0.674
Dvlp Stud Objct	-0.628
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholarshp	-0.473
Stud Careers	0.566
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	-0.482
Presrv Heritage	-0.496
Assist Citizens	0.692
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.804
Sat Area Needs	0.602
Keep Costs Down	0.546
Acc Gd Stud Onl	-0.782
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	-0.540
Keep Harmony	0.531
Stud Univ Govrn	0.567
Undrgrad Instr	0.605
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	-0.654
Maxim Opportunty	-0.588
Prov Stud Activ	0.501
Stud Rgt Inquir	-0.560
Position	
Preserv Character	-0.482
Incrs U Prestige	-0.656

Table 89

Goals and Power Structure

State Government

Student-Expressive	
Stud Intellect	-0.695
Stud Character	-0.445
Affct Stud Perm	-0.717
Dvlp Stud Objct	-0.676
Student-Instrumental	
Train Scholarshp	-0.602
Stud Careers	0.514
Direct Service	
Dissemnt Ideas	-0.528
Presrv Heritage	-0.496
Assist Citizens	0.480
Research	
Adaptation	
Educ to Utmost	0.554
Sat Area Needs	0.506
Keep Costs Down	0.476
Acc Gd Stud Onl	-0.627
Management	
Encourg Grad Wk	-0.615
Keep Harmony	0.444
Stud Univ Govrn	0.532
Undegrad Instr	0.496
Motivation	
Protct Acd Frdm	-0.583
Maxim Opportunty	-0.547
Stud Rgt Inquir	-0.577
Position	
Keep Up to Date	-0.483
Incrs U Prestg	-0.529

Appendix: The Questionnaire

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS AND UNIVERSITY GOALS

A STUDY OF THE

CENTER FOR ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

EDWARD GROSS
PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY

and

PAUL V. GRAMBSCH
DEAN, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
and
PROFESSOR OF MANAGEMENT

This questionnaire is being given to *all* presidents, vice-presidents, deans, department chairmen and a carefully selected sample of other academic administrators and of nonadministrative faculty at 80 major universities in the United States. A study of such scope has never before been attempted. It will provide us with a comprehensive picture of who administrators are, how they see the university, and how they differ in their influence on university policy. In spite of the magnitude of the study it depends completely on the kindness and generosity of each respondent. The results should be of value to you in your university work. They will appear in the form of published articles and monographs.

This research is supported by the UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION.

This questionnaire is completely confidential. No one will see it except the professional members of our research staff. Nevertheless, for purposes of control of returns, we need your name to serve as a double-check on the accuracy of our number control system. We can then check it off our sample list so that we know who has been heard from. Please write it in here:

NAME____

B.O.B. NO. 51-6433
EXPIRES 7-31-65

1. THE GOALS OF THIS UNIVERSITY

One of the great issues in American education has to do with the proper aims or goals of the university. The question is: What are we trying to accomplish? Are we trying to prepare people for jobs, to broaden them intellectually, or what? Below we have listed a large number of the more commonly claimed aims, intentions or goals of a university. We would like you to react to each of these in two different ways:

(1) **How important *is* each aim at this university?**

(2) **How important *should* the aim be at this university?**

		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know or can't say
EXAMPLE: to serve as substitute parents	**is**	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

A person who had checked the alternatives in the manner shown above would be expressing his perception that the aim, intention or goal, "to serve as substitute parents," *is* of medium importance at his university but that he believes it *should be of no importance* as an aim, intention, or goal of his university.

NOTE: "of absolutely top importance" should only be checked if the aim is *so* important that, if it were to be removed, the university would be shaken to its very roots and its character changed in a fundamental way.

ALL QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT *THIS* UNIVERSITY, that is, THE ONE AT WHICH YOU ARE PRESENTLY EMPLOYED.

GOALS

		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know or can't say	For office use only
hold our staff in the face of inducements offered by other universities	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	11
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
make sure that on *all* important issues (not only curriculum), the will of the full-time faculty shall prevail	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	12
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
encourage students to go into graduate work	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	13
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
protect the faculty's right to academic freedom	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
provide special training for part-time adult students, through extension courses, special short courses, correspondence courses, etc.	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	15
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the university, rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	16
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
produce a student who, whatever else may be done to him, has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	17
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	18
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
make a good consumer of the student—a person who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and can make good consumer choices	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	19
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas that will change the society, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts, or politics	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	20
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
educate to his utmost capacities every high school graduate who meets basic legal requirements for admission	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	21
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
keep harmony between departments or divisions of the university when such departments or divisions do not see eye to eye on important matters	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	22
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

GOALS (cont.)

		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know or can't say	
make this a place in which faculty have maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a manner satisfactory to them by their own criteria	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	23
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
develop greater pride on the part of faculty, staff and students in their university and the things it stands for	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	24
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
keep up to date and responsive	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	25
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
make sure the student is permanently affected (in mind and spirit) by the great ideas of the great minds of history	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	26
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research, and/or creative endeavor	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	27
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
serve as a center for the preservation of the cultural heritage	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	28
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
orient ourselves to the satisfaction of the special needs and problems of the immediate geographical region	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	29
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
involve students in the government of the university	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	30
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
make sure the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible.	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	31
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
maintain top quality in all programs we engage in	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	32
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphases and point of view, its "character"	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	33
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
provide the student with skills, attitudes, contacts, and experiences which maximize the likelihood of his occupying a high status in life and a position of leadership in society	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	34
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
carry on pure research	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	35
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

GOALS (cont.)		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know or can't say	
keep costs down as low as possible through more efficient utilization of time, and space, reduction of course duplication, etc.	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	36
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, perquisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to the functioning of this university	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	37
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind, and any attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	38
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
produce a well-rounded student, that is one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual and esthetic potentialities have all been cultivated	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	39
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
assist citizens directly through extension programs, advice, consultation, and the provision of useful or needed facilities and services other than through teaching	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	40
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
ensure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs we offer (validating groups include accrediting bodies, professional societies, scholarly peers at other universities, and respected persons in intellectual or artistic circles)	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	41
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
maintain a balanced level of quality across the whole range of programs we engage in	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	42
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
make sure the university is run democratically insofar as that is feasible	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	43
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
produce a student who is able to perform his citizenship responsibilities effectively	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	44
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
accommodate only students of high potential in terms of the specific strengths and emphases of this university	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	45
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	46
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
prepare students specifically for useful careers	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	47
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

GOALS (cont.)

		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know or can't say	
provide cultural leadership for the community through university-sponsored programs in the arts, public lectures by distinguished persons, athletic events, and other performances, displays or celebrations which present the best of culture, popular or not	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	48
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
carry on applied research	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	49
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially (other than students and recipients of services) to the finances and other material resource needs of the university	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	50
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, perquisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to *his own profession or discipline*	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	51
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	52
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
involve faculty in the government of the university	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	53
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
provide a full round of student activities	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	54
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
increase the prestige of the university or, if you believe it is already extremely high, ensure maintenance of that prestige	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	55
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	56
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards)	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	57
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

In spite of the length of the above list, it is entirely possible that we have not included aims or goals which are important at this university, or we may have badly stated such an aim or goal; if so, please take this opportunity to correct us by writing them in below.

GOAL		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know or can't say	
________________________	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	58
________________________	**should be**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
________________________	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	59
________________________	**should be**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

2. WHO MAKE THE BIG DECISIONS

2.1 Think again of the kind of place this university is; that is, what its major goals or distinctive emphases are. Below are listed a number of positions and agencies. In each case, indicate by a check mark in the appropriate space *how much say* you believe persons in those positions have in affecting the major goals of the university. Note we are asking only about the *university as a whole.* A man might have a lot of say in his own department, but not in the university as a whole.

	a great deal of say	quite a bit of say	some say	very little say	no say at all	
The regents (or trustees)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	11__
Legislators	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	12__
Sources of large private grants or endowments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	13__
Federal government agencies or offices	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14__
State government agencies or offices	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	15__
The President	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	16__
The vice-presidents (or provosts)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	17__
Dean of the graduate school	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	18__
Dean of liberal arts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	19__
Deans of professional schools as a group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	20__
Chairmen of departments, considered as a group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	21__
The faculty, as a group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	22__
The students, as a group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	23__
Parents of students, as a group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	24__
The citizens of the state, as a group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	25__
Alumni, as a group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	26__

2.2 Below is listed a number of areas in which decisions of importance to the university must be made. How big a role would you say the faculty plays in each of those areas of decision-making? We are asking here for your total assessment, including not only formal participation (committees and the like) but informal influence, veto power, and any other kind of influence.

AREA OF DECISIONS	faculty views prevail completely	faculty have much influence	faculty have moderate influence	faculty have little influence	
Educational policies	☐	☐	☐	☐	27__
Faculty personnel policies	☐	☐	☐	☐	28__
Financial affairs and capital improvements	☐	☐	☐	☐	29__
Student affairs	☐	☐	☐	☐	30__
Public and alumni relations	☐	☐	☐	☐	31__

2.3 Each of the following external groups or agencies affect university operations in various ways. Some are viewed as desirable, some as not. What we would like to know is whether any or all of these groups or agencies affect the work *you* do in any ways that you can perceive.

	a major effect on my work	a moderate effect on my work	little effect on my work	
lumni of the university	☐	☐	☐	32__
Agencies supplying funds for contract research	☐	☐	☐	33__
Local government	☐	☐	☐	34__
State government (executive)	☐	☐	☐	35__
State government (legislative)	☐	☐	☐	36__
ederal government	☐	☐	☐	37__

	a major effect on my work	a moderate effect on my work	little effect on my work	
accrediting bodies	☐	☐	☐	38
donors	☐	☐	☐	39
foundations	☐	☐	☐	40
churches or religious orders	☐	☐	☐	41

3. ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY IN GENERAL

In general, how would you describe the rule-atmosphere at this university: (Please check the appropriate space) 42

☐ 1. I find it hard to believe there are *any* rules at all around here. People seem to do as they please.
☐ 2. In general, a good deal of laxity is permitted compared to what I know of other places.
☐ 3. The rules are respected, though exceptions are permitted when proper.
☐ 4. The rules are very important. Exceptions are very rare.
☐ 5. This is really a rule-emphasizing place, practically everything goes "by the book."

4. THE PERSON TO WHOM YOU GO FOR AN AUTHORITATIVE DECISION

Think now of the person to whom you regularly go when you need an authoritative decision on some line of action you contemplate in your work. (For a non-administrative faculty member, this would normally be the head of his department or section; for a chairman or head, the person would be his dean or director; for a dean or director, a vice-president or provost; for the president, the governing body as a group.)

Just so it is clear, please state the title of this person in your case:______________________________.

4.1 How important would you say that person is in terms of your ability to do your job well: 43

☐ 1. Absolutely essential. Without his active cooperation and help, I could hardly operate at all.
☐ 2. Absolutely essential, but only in a veto sense. That is, if he blocks me, I am stymied.
☐ 3. Very important. He can make my job quite a lot easier, or quite a lot harder.
☐ 4. Important. He can make my job easier or harder.
☐ 5. Of only moderate importance. He is an obstacle who can give me trouble if he makes up his mind to but, much of the time, I do my job without much help or hindrance from him.
☐ 6. Of little significance to me in comparison with some others (for example, people in the community, or people at other universities).

4.2 Which of the following words come closest to describing that person's style of leadership? 44

☐ autocratic
☐ democratic
☐ laissez-faire (lets people do pretty well what they wish)

4.3 All things considered, how do you feel about your relationship to that person? 45

☐ 1. Completely satisfied
☐ 2. A good relationship on the whole, but there are some features of it I do not like.
☐ 3. Quite a few problems in dealing with him, but it could be worse.
☐ 4. A rather poor relationship, but I can live with it.
☐ 5. Completely unsatisfied.

4.4 How much autonomy do you feel you have in relation to that person: 46

☐ 1. Not enough
☐ 2. Just about the right amount
☐ 3. Too much

4.5 How close are you to him socially? (Please check an appropriate space) 47

Very close______|______|______|______|______Strictly business

5. THE POWER I HAVE

On the line below indicate with a check the approximate amount of power you feel you have to get the things done that ou would like to get done in connection with your university role. 48___

A great deal________|________|________|________|________No power at all

6. CRITERIA OF EVALUATION

Periodically department chairmen and deans are faced with the task of evaluating members of the faculty for purposes f recommending salary increments and promotions. Granting, with Tawney, that a man's "worth is something between his God nd himself," what criteria do you think administrators should use in evaluating faculty members?

Below are listed some of the more commonly mentioned criteria. Indicate in the appropriate bracket your view of how nportant they should be.

	very important	important	of little importance	
Teaching performance	☐	☐	☐	49___
ublications	☐	☐	☐	50___
Honors received	☐	☐	☐	51___
tudent evaluations	☐	☐	☐	52___
Other job offers received	☐	☐	☐	53___
Service to the community	☐	☐	☐	54___
otal effectiveness in working with students	☐	☐	☐	55___
Ability to secure research grants	☐	☐	☐	56___
tatements of other faculty members	☐	☐	☐	57___
Ability to get along with colleagues	☐	☐	☐	58___
esearch accomplished	☐	☐	☐	59___
Research potential	☐	☐	☐	60___
Committee and other administrative service	☐	☐	☐	61___

OTHER IMPORTANT CRITERIA

____________________	☐	☐	62___
____________________	☐	☐	63___
____________________	☐	☐	64___

7.1 Below is listed a number of the major schools and colleges in this university. We would like you to indicate your ranking of each one in terms of the *calibre of the faculty,* as you believe it to be. In most cases, presumably, only two or three should be ranked as falling in the first category: "calibre at the very top." The basis of comparison should be limited to this university only. Thus "calibre at the very top" means at the very top *here,* not at *all* universities. If you have no such school, just leave it blank.

	calibre at the very top	first-rate faculty—but some exceptions	a good calibre group, but needs some improvement	faculty comes up to minimal standards only	too many of faculty are below par. A source of embarrassment	
ngineering	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	11___
Dentistry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	12___
Education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	13___
harmacy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14___
Law	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	15___
rchitecture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	16___
Medicine	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	17___
Veterinary Medicine	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	18___
ocial Sciences	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	19___

	calibre at the very top	first-rate faculty—but some exceptions	a good calibre group, but needs some improvement	faculty comes up to minimal standards only	too many of faculty are below par. A source of embarrassment	
Physical Sciences	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	20.
Humanities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	21.
Business School	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	22.
Home Economics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	23.
Agriculture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	24.
Forestry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	25.
Journalism	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	26.
Social Work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	27.
Nursing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	28.
Public Health	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	29.

7.2 Which of the following comes closer to your conception of the proper posture for an academic dean to assume in his relations with the higher university administration: (If you yourself are an academic dean, then answer this question in terms of yourself only. If you are a department chairman, answer this question in terms of the dean who heads your division or school.) 30.

☐ (a) *Primarily* a representative of his area of responsibility *to* the university administration.

☐ (b) *Primarily* a representative of the university administration *to* his area of responsibility.

7.3 Which of the following comes closer to your conception of the proper posture for a department chairman to assume in his relations with his dean: (If you yourself are an academic dean, answer this only in terms of the department chairmen who report to you. If you are a chairman, answer the question only in terms of your relations with your own dean.) 31.

☐ (a) *Primarily* a representative of his department *to* the dean.

☐ (b) *Primarily* a representative of his dean *to* his department.

8. SOME OF YOUR IDEAS ABOUT YOURSELF AND YOUR WORK

8.1 It would take some very strong inducements to get me to leave this university for a position elsewhere. 32.

strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8.2 Would you leave this university if you were offered a job at one of the top five (in excellence or quality) universities in the country? (If you yourself feel you are now in one of the top five, then think of one of the other four): 33.

☐ At a substantially lower salary

☐ At the same salary

☐ At a substantially higher salary

☐ Wouldn't leave

8.3 I get most of my intellectual stimulation from: (please number in rank order, with 1 meaning most stimulation and 4 least stimulation)

☐ On-campus colleagues and associates 34.

☐ Professional associates elsewhere 35.

☐ Periodicals, books, and other publications 36.

☐ Groups in the community (not excluding some which include persons who are also at the university) 37.

8.4 If my work were to be judged by a "jury of my peers," I would want that jury to be made up most of persons drawn from: (Please number in rank order, with 1 meaning the most preferred jury and 4 the least preferred jury.)

☐ Persons employed at universities in academic and/or administrative capacities 38.

☐ On-campus colleagues and associates 39.

☐ Professional associates (here and elsewhere) 40.

☐ People whom I respect in the community (not excluding some who happen to be at the university) 41.

8.5 It would take some very strong inducements to get me to accept a position at any place other than a university. 42___

strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8.6 (a) How many books have you published in the last 5 years? 43___

☐ none
☐ 1
☐ 2+

(b) How many articles have you published in the last 5 years? (Count any papers delivered at professional meetings, but not published, as articles) 44___

☐ none
☐ 1
☐ 2-5
☐ 6-10
☐ 10+

8.7 (Faculty please ignore this question)
One of my most important responsibilities is to maintain my competence as a university administrator by keeping up to date on educational and educational administrative problems in general, even at the possible cost of neglecting my specific duties at this university. 45___

strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8.8 Suppose you received a very attractive offer at a university comparable to this one in all major respects, and which would enable you to pursue your professional interests at least as well as you are able at this university. However, the university was located a considerable distance away. How much would each of the following factors weigh in your thinking:

	a great deal	quite a lot	some	hardly any	not at all	
aving to leave the climate and geo-aphic setting here	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	46___
having to give up my ties and contacts with people in the community here hose interests are similar to mine	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	47___
having to give up my friends here	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	48___
aving to give up the recreational oppor-nities here	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	49___
having to give up the intellectual atmosphere of the local community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	50___
aving to close out my financial investments in the area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	51___
having to move the family	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	52___

If this question is completely hypothetical for you, since you would not even consider another offer under any circumstances you can envision at the present time, please check here ☐ 53___

.9 Control, such as that achieved through rules, regulations, policy statements and the chain of command, should be considered one of the most important activities at this university. 54___

strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8.10 In my personal opinion, the final word in case of a dispute over something connected with my work should rest with: 55___

☐ (1) my professional colleagues (those in your discipline here, and elsewhere, or, if you are an administrator, then other administrators in positions similar to your own)

☐ (2) the head of my department (or division, or school, or university)

.11 In matters connected with my work, it is best to develop certain generally agreed upon standards so that each problem is dealt with according to those standards, rather than its own peculiar features. 56___

agree	strongly agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8.12 In my work, I feel it is important that I limit myself only to my specialized field of competence if I am to do a good job. 57___

strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8.13 In my work, I feel it is essential that I avoid personally identifying with the person who is seeking my help (student, client, subordinate). 58___

strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8.14 I believe a person in my position should be given the responsibility he has only if he *demonstrates* his competence, with no consideration at all of whom he happens to be or what his connections are. 59___

strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8.15 Of how many organizations, clubs, societies, teams or other *voluntary* groups are you a member? (Approximations will do)

Professional or directly work-connected	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 over 9	60___
If you have ever been an officer in any, how many such positions have you filled?	0 1 2 3 4 5 over 5	61___
Social or recreational	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 over 9	62___
If you have ever been an officer in any, how many such positions have you filled?	0 1 2 3 4 5 over 5	63___
Political, community and others	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 over 9	64___
If you have ever been an officer in any, how many such positions have you filled?	0 1 2 3 4 5 over 5	65___

9. LASTLY, ABOUT YOURSELF

9.1 Present age (nearest birthday): 66___

☐ under 25 ☐ 26-30 ☐ 31-35 ☐ 36-40 ☐ 41-45
☐ 46-50 ☐ 51-55 ☐ 56-60 ☐ 61-65 ☐ 66 or over

9.2 Sex: 67___

☐ M
☐ F

9.3 Number of children: (please circle the correct number) 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or more. 68___

9.4 Race:

☐ White
☐ Negro
☐ Mongoloid

9.5 Country of birth of father ______________________________ 69___

9.6 Father's education:

Years of schooling completed:

☐ 11 or less.
☐ 12.
☐ more than 12. 70___

Degree(s) obtained if any: ______________________________ 71___

Mother's education:

Years of schooling completed:

☐ 11 or less.
☐ 12.
☐ more than 12. 72___

Degree(s) obtained if any: ______________________________ 73___

.7 Father's occupation during most of his adult life: (please be specific) ________________ 11___

12___

.8 Your place of birth: 13___

If rural, name nearest city ________ 14___

If urban, name city ________ ________________ 15___

(state, if U.S.A.) (country)

9.9 Place in which the greater part of your life up to age 17 was spent: 16___

If rural, name nearest city ________ 17___

If urban, name city ________ ________________ 18___

(state, if U.S.A.) (country)

9.10 Church affiliation:

☐ Catholic ☐ None ☐ Other

☐ Jewish ☐ Protestant (If Protestant or Other, please specify ________) 19___

.11 Sources of income: (for income tax year 1964)

	Percentage of income derived from this source	
Academic Salary	________	20-21
Consulting	________	22-23
Income from writing	________	24-25
Other sources (please specify)	________	26-27
	100%	

.12 Marital status: (check one) 28___

☐ Single 29___

☐ Married 30___

☐ Divorced, and presently unmarried 31___

☐ Separated

☐ Widowed

If married and male, a question about your wife:

Education of wife's father:

Number of years: ☐ 11 or less

☐ 12

☐ more than 12

Academic degrees, if any: ________________

Occupation of wife's father during most of his adult life,

(please be specific): ________________

9.13 Your education: 32___

☐ 11 years or less 33___

☐ 12 years 34___

☐ some years of college or university, but no degree received 35___

☐ B.A. (or other bachelor's degree requiring 4 years or more) 36___

If so, what college or university? ________________ Year received ________ 37___

Field of specialization, if any ________ 38___

☐ M.A. or M.S., or other Master's degree requiring at least one year beyond the bachelor's degree.

If so, what university or college? ________________ Year received ________

If so, what field of specialization ________________

☐ M.D. If so, what university? ________________ Year received ________

☐ Ph.D. If so, what university? ________________

If so, what field of specialization ________________

Year received ________

☐ Other degree than those named.

What degree? ________ What college or university? ________________ What field of specialty? ________________ Year received ________

9.14 Job history:

Title of present position (if more than one is held, please list the other(s): ____________

Department, if any ____________

List below only positions held for 9 months or longer: (please start with *most recent* position)

	Kind of Position	Name of Employer	Period of Employment
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			

9.15 This question is optional

Income data will enable us to perform a number of important analyses. We recognize, however, that persons are, understandably, reluctant to reveal what they feel is a personal matter. Would you therefore simply provide an approximation as follows:

Total income from all sources, before taxes, in the 1964 tax year (i.e., an amount no more than 25% above or below your actual income). $____________ 39-

THE REMAINING QUESTIONS ARE FOR ADMINISTRATORS ONLY

9.16 How do you feel about your administrative job(s) at the university?

☐ (1) excellent. I can ask for nothing better

☐ (2) good.

☐ (3) fair.

☐ (4) poor. I hope to make a change 41

9.17 Think now of your predecessor in your position. How long did he hold the position? ______years. How long did the man before him hold the position? ______years. 42- 44-

9.18 What are your plans for the future so far as your work is concerned?

☐ Continue in my present position, or one much like it 46

☐ Move up to a higher administrative position, or one like my present one at a more prestigious university, if an opportunity comes up

If so, what would represent the culmination of your ambition in administration? ____________

____

☐ Get into, or return to, teaching or research in this, or another university

☐ Leave university work altogether and go into some other kind of institution

9.19 How would you describe your feelings about your career thus far: 47

☐ Good progress thus far, and the future looks good

☐ Good progress thus far, but I'm not at all sure about the future

☐ Good progress and I feel reasonably satisfied with where I am. I doubt that anything much better will turn up

☐ My career has had so many ups and downs that I'm not at all sure just what my next move will be or ought to be

☐ I am blocked where I am and will have to move out to get ahead

☐ The future does not look good at all and I do not have any good hope for the long-range future

9.20 Suppose you were leaving the university for another position, and the administration asked you to recommend someone as your replacement. Suppose, further, that you knew your views would weigh heavily in the final decision. What kind of person would you recommend, and what kind would you oppose? Let us assume, further, that you are leaving your present position with great reluctance and that you have great affection for the university. Hence you want to see yourself replaced with the person most likely to do a top-notch job after you have gone. In answering this question, choose one of the alternatives indicated by the initials under each attribute. These initials stand for the following:

am	absolutely must be, or must have
ps	preferably should be, or should have
m	may or may not be, or may or may not have
pn	preferably should not be, or should not have
an	absolutely must not be, or must not have

EXAMPLE:

brown hair
am [✓ ps] m pn an

black hair
am ps [✓ m] pn an

white hair
am ps m [✓ pn] an

red hair
am ps m pn [✓ an]

In this example, we have underlined the alternatives to indicate the reply of a person who felt that the person who would replace you *preferably should have brown* hair, *may or may not have* black hair, *preferably should not have* white hair, and *absolutely must not have* red hair. Please be sure to check *each* attribute.

church member 48___
am ps m pn an

Protestant 49___
am ps m pn an

Catholic 50___
am ps m pn an

Jew 51___
am ps m pn an

conservative in his politics 52___
am ps m pn an

liberal in his politics 53___
am ps m pn an

Democrat 54___
am ps m pn an

Republican 55___
am ps m pn an

Bachelor's degree 56___
am ps m pn an

Ph.D. degree 57___
am ps m pn an

A Doctor's degree other than or in addition to the Ph.D. 58___
am ps m pn an

university experience 59___
am ps m pn an

research experience 60___
am ps m pn an

a scholar 61___
am ps m pn an

personally ambitious 62___
am ps m pn an

easy going 63___
am ps m pn an

sold on the importance of pure research 64___
am ps m pn an

graduate work in an academic discipline 65___
am ps m pn an

sold on the importance of applied research 66___
am ps m pn an

graduate work in one of the physical or biological sciences 67___
am ps m pn an

(if the position is in a professional school)
experience as a practitioner
am ps m pn an 68___

previous experience in a university administrative position of some sort 69___
am ps m pn an

graduate work in one of the liberal arts disciplines or social sciences 70___
am ps m pn an

If there is an attribute other than listed above which you think would be *absolutely essential* or which would *completely disqualify* a person, please mention it (or them, if more than one) below:

absolutely essential ________________________________ 71___

completely disqualified if ________________________________ 72___

9.21 Assuming other things are equal, which of the following would you recommend as your replacement? 73___

☐ The person more acceptable to outside persons and groups that the university must deal with (legislative, major sources of endowment, etc).

☐ The person more acceptable to the faculty of the university as a whole.

THE END

THANK YOU

Please use the enclosed, self-addressed, reply envelope to return the questionnaire.